

CHAPTERS 1 to 6

CHAPTER 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
62	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	1.1	Object	<p>The entire plan is based on government orders rather than local need. It provides for too many houses.</p> <p>Assessments on a local level of what exactly is the demand, not something based on the government's population projections</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
163 188	Rod Dixon [2774] Mrs Irene Stott [2780]	1.1	Object	The process for submitting comment seems to have been made excessively difficult and designed for the convenience of the planners and to deter the average person. I consider myself computer literate but it took me considerable effort to sort out the system. I would think this is likely to reduce the number of comments.	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Public Participation Plan in the Delivery Agreement. There were several methods available for comment - paper form or electronically, interactive website, letter or e-mails. There were instructions available for anyone to contact the Unit to discuss these methods</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
391	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	1.2	Support	Ffestiniog Town Council support keeping Blaenau Ffestiniog as a Town Service Centre. This is important in terms of public transportation, local services, and much more.	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
409	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	1.2	Object	Additional comment. Where houses are built slowly, the Local Plan should encourage people to create one dwelling out of two houses next to each other.	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - There is no need to obtain planning permission to combine two houses next to each other to form a single house. If modifications, extensions, etc. associated with the development are necessary, Policy PCYFF 1 promotes a good standard of development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
410	Cyngor Tref	1.2	Object	Additional comment - It should be ensured that elements	<b>Comment noted</b> - The Plan was prepared

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]			of the plan in Blaenau Ffestiniog coincide with the Local Plan that will be created for Snowdonia National Park. What cooperation exists between Gwynedd Council's Planning Departments and the National Park?	<p>in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Public Participation Plan in the Delivery Agreement. Note the need to consult with specific stakeholders, which include the SNPA. Transboundary negotiations will continue to take place.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change.</b></p>
412	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	1.2	Support	Additional comment - The Town Council supports the vision for Blaenau Ffestiniog on page 41.	<p><b>Supportive comment noted.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
162 189	Rod Dixon [2774] Mrs Irene Stott [2780]	1.3	Object	<p>The process is undemocratic and, as far as I can see, has been compiled by the planners with no consideration for the population and has not been considered and passed by the local councils - the peoples representatives. Existing policies and planning guidance seem to have been ignored. The Preferred Strategy Document was very generalised and had insufficient detail for constructive comment.</p> <p>Submit the plan for council approval at full council</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Public Participation Plan in the Delivery Agreement as well as the Consultation Report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				meetings	There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.  <b>No change</b>
272	Mrs Marian Jones [2832]	1.3	Object	<p>Apparently, you have been consulting with the public. Nobody has contacted me nor any member of my family. Have you had contact with a vast percentage of the County's population? And had a cross-section in terms of age and personal circumstances?</p> <p>I believe that the public have not been notified about the plan. Everyone should have the information in full, in a language which is easy to understand. Everyone should be individually interviewed and had an opportunity to voice their opinion. This would give a fairer picture of the local need for housing.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Public Participation Plan in the Delivery Agreement as well as the Consultation Report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
152	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	1.4	Object	<p>As noted when responding to the Preferred Strategy - the plan was created from top to bottom, and not from the bottom up as therefore it would be unable to address the real needs of the County, and eventually, the country.</p> <p>Commence with the plan by taking local needs into account, adding them together and see what the needs of the country are in its entirety. Respect will be paid to local needs without forgetting the more widespread needs. As it stands, the "great need" surpasses the local</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				need.	<p>the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
271	Iwan Edgar [2833]	1.5	Object	The cart before the horse  Assess the requirements from the bottom up, they are not ordained	<b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd & Anglesey Population & Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology & Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
356	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	1.9	Object	<p>Give observations</p> <p>Amend the procedure that you have here which allows anyone to include evidence with the observations. Unfortunately, as far as I can tell (and like I was told by an officer) the system is faulty.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Public Participation Plan in the Delivery Agreement. There were several methods available for comment - paper form or electronically, interactive website, letter or e-mails. There were instructions available for anyone to contact the Unit to discuss these methods</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
510	Marian Roberts [2973]	1.11	Object	<p>I am of the opinion that both councils have not shown that the development would not harm the situation of the Welsh language from a community point of view. They do not have evidence which proves that there would be no overdevelopment. We know about the consumptive impact of the migration on the Welsh language on the English villages and towns of the north coastline, and now this has happened, and is happening in front of our eyes here in Gwynedd and Anglesey.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
500	Marian Roberts [2973]	1.14	Object	evidence not on a believable basis (Soundness test CE2)  * base a Local Development Plan on local need, forming community development plans to avoid overprovision that could lead to non-Welsh migration;	<b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.  Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
513	Marian Roberts [2973]	1.13	Object	A sweeping statement like this "The status of the language is very healthy in Botwnnog.. Y Ffor and Chwilog" (under BOTWNNOG) is without reliable evidence and planning to build 40 houses there is	<b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				completely irresponsible. (Deposit Plan Linguistic Impact Assessment, February 2015)	<p>the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
514	Marian Roberts [2973]	1.13	Object	<p>The publicity regarding the consultation was very limited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* No mention in "Newyddion Gwynedd" which is sent to every household and office in December and March and not with the council tax bill that was sent a while before the consultation ended.</li> <li>* Obtaining paper copies of the documents to study would have set people back hundreds of pounds.</li> <li>* The public drop in sessions were limited with little publicity surrounding them.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Public Participation Plan in the Delivery Agreement. There were several methods available for comment - paper form or electronically, interactive website, letter or e-mails. There were instructions available for anyone to contact the Unit to discuss these methods</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
140	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	1.17	Object	The first sentence states: "The Examination ensures that the Plan is based on sound information and thinking and that the views of those with concerns about the Plan have been considered." As far as we can see there is no evidence that amendments suggested by us that is Llanystumdwy Community council (and other organisations) in May/ June 2013 have been considered.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Initial Consultation Report that was published at the same time as the Deposit Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
351	Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg (Menna Machreth) [2819]	1.17	Object	We believe that several of the soundness tests are flawed. C1: we believe that the plan undermines Gwynedd's Language Policy 2014-17 C2: the Welsh Government Planning Bill is currently being formed therefore it would be unwise to make a decision without considering the principles of that bill C4: a local needs assessment has not been undertaken CE2: There is no evidence in the plan to show how the number of houses	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				was decided upon for each community. There is no evidence to prove that the plan would not have a detrimental impact on the Welsh language CE4: it is not flexible to deal with changing circumstances	<p>Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's monitoring framework.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
820	Jina Gwyrfai [3092]	1.20	Object	<p>This Plan has been presented to the residents of Gwynedd and Ynys Mon in a way that is surely incomprehensible to the majority. The provision of a 'summary' - glossy &amp; misleading has further hidden the major problems/ flaws in the whole plan, i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* insufficient emphasis on the opportunities arising from the existing housing stock;</li> <li>* lack of sufficient evidence locally that housing is needed, e.g. can the need for 323 houses in Pwllheli be justified;</li> <li>* detrimental impact of migration.</li> </ul> <p>There needs to be firm statistical evidence for the need for new homes, not influenced by profitability for</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations.</p> <p>The intention of the executive summary booklet that was published at the same time as the Deposit Plan was to give a general outline of the Plan, to explain the process of public consultation, and to explain how to comment. It was noted that it was necessary to look at the full document in order to comment on the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				builders and migration figures.	<p>Deposit Plan.</p> <p>The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
77	Cyngor Cymuned Y Felinheli (Cyng Sian Gwenllian)	1.22	Support	We agree with the designation for Felinheli and warmly welcome it. The Local Market policy could be relevant to Bangor's side of the ward, but could prevent people from other parts of Gwynedd e.g. Llyn, Meirionnydd from constructing windfall sites. At present, therefore, we do	<p><b>Supportive comment noted.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	[2683]			not wish to be included under 'Open Market' but will keep an eye on the situation if we feel as though we need the additional cover for the future. We are also pleased that only 100% affordable housing would be able to be built according to local need on the village's outskirts.	
114	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	1.26	Object	Need to collaborate and carefully plan on the needs of the people of Bangor, establish a committee to look at the housing needs of the people of Bangor, look at relocating the city's boundaries? Need for affordable housing, robust infrastructure. Brownfield! - not greenfield, consider impact on the Welsh language	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
287	Mr John Hughes [2676]	1.26	Object	<p>1.28 Table 1 Clusters. Llanengan has been recategorised as a cluster, while Sarn Bach and Llangian as rural villages. Why?</p> <p>Llanengan is the District name (Plwy Llanenga) larger and more active than both other, community center, ysgol feithrin, snooker, Church and a Pub ( Hub). A very Welsh living village.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – local planning authorities require a sustainable network of settlements, which satisfy economic needs, the environment and health whilst respecting local distinctiveness and safeguarding the cultural character and identity of communities.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan has identified a Hierarchy of towns and villages that have a specific role and function. The methodology was developed and published in Topic Paper 5 “Developing the Settlement Hierarchy” in order to identify settlements based on their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services.</p> <p>Llanengan doesn’t meet the criteria to be classified as a Rural Village.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
393	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs	1.26	Support	Ffestiniog Town Council is keeping Blaenau Ffestiniog as a Town Service Centre. This is important in terms of public	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Ann Coxon) [2940]			transport, local services and much more.	<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
418	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	1.26	Object	It should be ensured that elements of the plan in Blaenau Ffestiniog correspond with the Local Plan that will be created for Snowdonia National Park. What cooperation exists between Gwynedd Council's Planning Departments and the National Park?	<b>Comment noted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Public Participation Plan in the Delivery Agreement. Note the need to consult with specific stakeholders, which include the SNPA. Transboundary negotiations will continue to take place.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.  <b>No change.</b>
419	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	1.26	Object	Additional comment - Where houses are slowly sold, the Local Plan should encourage people to create one dwelling out of two houses next door to each other.	<b>Comment noted</b> - there is no need to obtain planning permission to form one dwelling from two houses situated next to each other, only for external changes which are not permitted under the General Permitted Development Order. The Plan policies could promote these kinds of changes.  <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change.</b></p>
631	Cyng./Counc Mike Stevens [406]	1.26	Object	<p>For the long term sustainability of Gwynedd, it cannot be beneficial that all the urban service centres are in the north of the county. Tywyn is regarded as the 'Mother Town' of South Meirionnydd servicing six large villages who look to Tywyn for their major services. A new x-ray department in the hospital and a new police and fire station are currently being built. Health authorities recognise the geographical importance of Tywyn. Tywyn should be designated as an Urban Centre equal to the current four in Gwynedd to allow the growth in housing and jobs retain local people.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Local planning authorities need to have a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>Tywyn does not meet the criteria to be classified as an Urban Service Centre</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No change</b>
142	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	1.27	Object	The figures in this paragraph are fraudulent. It is stated "facilitate the provision of 7,184 new homes." When a slippage of 10% is added the figure is 7,902. It is stated that about 50% have been built or with planning consent "which means that an additional 3,907 new homes." 50% of 7,902 is 3,951 that equates to an additional estate somewhere.	<b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>The annual Housing Land Surveys have informed the consideration given to sites that already have planning permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
217	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	1.27	Object	<p>Explain why the housing figure has been reduced from the preferred strategy figure.</p> <p>Concern on over reliance on existing historical planning consents and whether or not these will really deliver houses.</p> <p>Amend housing figure number to 7665. Ensure sites which have previous consents have been properly assess for deliver-ability.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
218	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	1.27	Object	<p>The housing figure does not appear to allow for a 4% vacancy rate which is required to allow the housing market to operate. Concern raised at the reliance on existing planning consents which have not delivered to date.</p> <p>Amend housing figure to 7471.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> - There is no national standard allowance. It will vary from region to region depending on the local situation. The 2011 Census gives a figure of 12.2% for Gwynedd and 10.5% for Anglesey. This level has been applied to all the statistical scenarios prepared by Edge Analytics. This information was entered in the Background Paper on projections for population, households and housing.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>The objection has drawn attention to the need to explain this issue better in the Deposit Plan itself.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the wording in paragraphs 7.4.2 to 7.4.4 to reference the background paper.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF13</b></p> <p>To improve the clarity of the Plan</p>
346	Mr Gareth Dobson [2917]	1.27	Object	<p>There is no evidence of the need for the number of housing noted within the plan. Indeed, it is arguable that the number of housing that has already been allocated within Gwynedd's local development plan is sufficient. Gwynedd and Anglesey County Councils are Welsh language communities and development of this scale would surely negatively impact the Welshness of these communities, especially in the local service centres as they have been described.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
815	Mr Iwan Edgar [251]	1.27	Object	<p>The number of houses proposed is more than is required for local need and is likely to promote in-migration of non- Welsh speakers, which will undermine the language in its stronghold. The Deposit Plan expresses support of the language, but by an over provision of housing that support is ineffective and misleading.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for:</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
153	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	1.28	Object	<p>The Hierarchy</p> <p>Change it so that there is a higher percentage in the clusters and in the countryside. The countryside will perish like this. Several people in the countryside want to build their own houses but this procedure is overly centralised.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>Directing more housing units that were not distributed to sites in the Clusters and the countryside in the Deposit Plan undermines the Spatial Strategy and the sustainability principles underpinning the Plan. The Deposit Plan refers to TAN6 - Plans for rural communities (2010). Policy TAI 19 promotes the restoration of appropriate existing buildings to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					residential use.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
337	Sally Baxter (Ms Sally Baxter) [2883]	1.28	Support	The Health Board recognises the need for development of appropriate housing to ensure inclusive, healthy communities for the anticipated population needs. We do not have specific objections to the development proposals. We would however wish to be involved in further impact assessment on population health of proposals and also the impact on healthcare provision, given challenges to recruitment, especially in the rural areas, and including Welsh language service provision.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b> - The Councils will consult with the Health Board regarding the relevant supplementary planning guidance. There will also be an opportunity for the Health Board to express its opinion on proposals at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
78	Cyngor Cymuned Y Felinheli (Cyng Sian Gwenllian) [2683]	1.32	Support	We support the affordable housing policy.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
143	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	1.32	Object	It is stated in the first point "Safeguarding and enhancing the Welsh language - by creating the right circumstances that will contribute to maintaining and creating Welsh speaking communities, e.g. facilitating a mixture of housing, employment opportunities, community services	<b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics "Gwynedd & Anglesey Population & Household

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>and facilities." We don't see anything in the document that explains how this will happen, - employment opportunities should have more emphasis than housing. Housing should follow employment.</p>	<p>Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results" (2014), "Explaining the difference between Welsh Government's 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd" (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>constraints on development.</p> <p>We also refer to Table 7 in part 5 of the Plan, which provides a list of relevant policies that promote developments to address individual strategic aims.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
154	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	1.32	Object	<p>The Policies - to safeguard the Welsh language</p> <p>Prioritise creating and getting work in the area as a first point of call, before building more houses that could be unnecessary - which in turn would attract retired people which would in due course be costly to the county's social and health services. It is okay to build houses where the need has been (roughly) measured beforehand.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
335	Miss Ffion Jones [2856]	1.32	Object	I believe that the Plan is much too large for local needs. Yes, housing is required, but more research needs to be undertaken in terms of asking local people about their needs.	<b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd & Anglesey Population & Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology & Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1098	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	1.32	Object	<p>Horizon considers the snapshot of the section on "Supporting the energy sector" is unduly restrictive. It is not credible that in each case for energy development effects will be able to be avoided. Support for development of energy projects should be supported where any significant adverse effects have been appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated to acceptable levels.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Agree that it is reasonable to amend the wording which refers to support for the energy sector to give the full picture.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend part of table 3 which refers to the energy sector to refer to mitigating effects.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>Focussed Change: NF1</b>  In order to ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.
141	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	1.33	Object	It is stated here: "the required annual monitoring.... (and) a full review (in) 4 years". By the time the Plan is adopted in December 2016 it will have been operational for 5 years without any monitoring or review.	<b>Comment noted</b> - The Plan is not a material planning consideration at present. The monitoring process will begin once it is adopted in accordance with the requirements of the Regulations for the preparation of local development plans.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
155	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	1.33	Support	Monitoring	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>

## CHAPTER 2 – INTRODUCTION

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
422	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	2.4	Object	It should be ensured that elements of the plan in Blaenau Ffestiniog correspond with the Local Plan that will be created for Snowdonia National Park. What cooperation exists between Gwynedd Council's Planning Departments and the National Park?	<b>Comment noted</b> - The Plan was prepared in accordance with the legislative requirements contained in the relevant statutory regulations. We refer to the Public Participation Plan in the Delivery

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>Agreement. Note the need to consult with specific stakeholders, which include the SNPA. Transboundary negotiations will continue to take place.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
139	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	2.7	Object	This paragraph states "The matters that are important to the area must be examined, based on evidence." We have collected evidence based on the facts presented in the Llanysumdwy Community Council Area Housing Needs Report (December 2014).	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - Topic Paper 4A Describing Housing Growth refers to the consideration given to local factors in determining the total demand for housing units. Factors include local housing need surveys. Settlement profiles will refer to the conclusions of the most recent surveys.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p>
156	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	2.7	Object	<p>The plan's robustness and evidence</p> <p>The evidence submitted is very vague, repetitive and based on government wishes at times.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The development of the Plan is based on the process of collecting and analysing information about a number of themes, e.g. facts that help to understand the present social, economic and environmental conditions in the area; past trends and future projections; as well</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>as factors likely to drive change in the future. The information has been recorded in a series of Topic and Background Papers referring to various reports from other stakeholders on various themes.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
157	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	2.8	Object	<p>Bring the plan together</p> <p>Change the plan so that local needs have priority above the national "needs" / aspirations.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The key issues and drivers of change locally were considered during the period of preparation of the Preferred Strategy. They were developed in consultation with the Key Stakeholder Group and opportunity was given to various stakeholders and the public to express views and ideas during 2011-2012. Also the Preferred Strategy document was subject to public consultation during 2013.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No change</b>
360	Cymdeithas yr Iaith Gymraeg (Menna Machreth) [2819]	2.12	Object	Evidence for the number of housing in every community is flawed. The plan does not show that a local need assessment has been undertaken. There is no evidence in the Plan to justify the claim that the Joint Local Development Plan would not have a detrimental impact on the Welsh language	<b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd & Anglesey Population & Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology & Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
384	Mr Gareth Dobson [2917]	2.14	Object	<p>I believe that the Preferred Strategy Scheme, which serves as a basis for the Deposit Plan is flawed. A development pattern should be established based on community need and good practice urban planning guidelines, not for private benefit as arises when an invitation is extended to private developers and when land owners bring land to the authority's attention.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>The period of demand for sites to be put on the Potential Land Register is a standard approach to obtain information about the availability of land for development or land which should be protected. The sites were then assessed in accordance with recognized methodology in order to establish if they matched the strategy of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

### CHAPTER 3 – POLICY CONTEXT

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
158	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	3.1	Object	<p>Regional and National Policies</p> <p>More emphasis on the local rather than regional and national</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Appropriate consideration is given to the local context.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
854	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	3.2	Object	<p>We note that paragraph 3.2 provides a broad summary of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) (July 2014 - Edition 7). Whilst we appreciate that summarising PPW and its TANs is an impossible feat within 2 paragraphs, we are concerned that no reference is made to the overall objective of the Welsh Government and PPW which is to deliver sustainable development and which within Section 4.2 is set out to provide within the plan making and decision making process, a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The paragraph already states that national planning policies and guidelines emphasize the role of the land use planning system in contributing towards achieving sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
819	Jina Gwyrfai [3092]	3.5	Object	<p>The Deposit Plan does not deliver the vision of the Wales Spatial Plan for the areas of Snowdonia and Anglesey namely to "sustain an economy...that will assist the area in retaining its unique character...to sustain the Welsh language" because the plans are based on inward migration which undermines the area's unique character and language. The "Population and Household Forecasts" theory uses a methodology which is based on consistent growth in inward migration and this is changing the character of our area. Also, its methodology is not sufficiently linked with Gwynedd (App A A.5). A</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The development of the Deposit Plan has given full consideration to the vision of the Spatial Plan for the area. Topic Paper 4A describes the different growth scenarios that were considered as well as local factors that drive the local housing market. Consideration was given to the existence of empty houses and holiday homes when converting total households to the total demand for housing units. Not much</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				Feasibility Study on the need for housing according to natural growth only - namely a "Natural Change" model only and to couple it with empty houses and second homes in the County.	<p>emphasis can be put on the 'Natural Change' scenario because that can prevent individuals from moving in and out of the area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1099 1100 1101	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	3.7, 3.8 & 3.9	Object	Horizon considers the clarity of these paragraphs could be improved, particularly the legal distinction in the Planning Act 2008 of the term "associated development" as it applies to Wales. The list of bullets illustrating types of associated development should be made consistent with the Wylfa SPG content. Minor errors in the description of the Wylfa Site NSIP regime should also be corrected.	<p><b>Accepted</b> - Agree that the wording needs to be consistent with the terminology used in legislation. Also agree that there should be clarity about the types of development that may be considered as ones associated with the Wylfa Newydd Project, and could therefore be subject to a planning application to the local council.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Amend the wording of paragraphs 3.7 – 3.9 to ensure accuracy and clarity.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF2</b></p>
297	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	3.10	Object	Given the emphasis given to protecting biodiversity reference should be made to the Local Biodiversity Action Plans for Gwynedd and Anglesey	<b>Comment noted</b> - It is not the aim of this section to address each plan, policy document and local strategy. Part 7.5 of the Deposit Plan shows how consideration



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>was given to the Local Biodiversity Action Plans.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1081	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	3.10	Object	Table 5 - refers to priorities of the Taith and TraCC Regional Transport Plans. These Plans are to be replaced by the North Wales Joint Local Transport Plan and the Mid Wales Joint Local Transport Plan. The plans should make reference to any committed highway improvements where relevant.	<p><b>Comment noted</b> – Since the Deposit Plan was prepared the North Wales and Mid Wales Joint Local Transport Plans have been published. Agree that the Plan should be amended to reflect this change.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend this section of the Plan to replace reference to the Regional Plans to refer to the Joint Local Plans.</p> <p><b>Focussed change: NF3</b></p>
1095	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	Table 5: The Policy Context	Object	NRW recommends that Table 5 includes reference to National Planning Policies including Planning Policy Wales and Technical Advice Notes.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – there is sufficient reference to PPW and TANs in paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					Plan to address the objector's comments.  <b>No change</b>

#### CHAPTER 4 – SPATIAL PROFILE AND KEY ISSUES

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
79	Cyngor Cymuned Y Felinheli (Cyng. Sian Gwenllian) [2683]	4.7	Support	We agree with the main issues that have been identified.	<b>Supportive comment noted.</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
269	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	4.7	Object	K1  K1 does not discuss the movement of people who were born outside of Wales which adds to the numbers of older people in the area. Some acknowledgement should be made of this, given that the area as it stands is being sold as a leisure area (Golf, Sailing) - a good place to retire.	<b>Not accepted</b> –K11 reflects the issue referred to.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.  <b>No change</b>
298	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	4.7	Support	K1 24-29 are welcomed	<b>Supportive comment noted.</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
350	WYG/Alliance Planning (Mr	4.7	Support	Our Client, Admiral Taverns, supports K16. The plan must address the insufficient supply, mix and range of housing	<b>Supportive comment noted.</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Mark Walton) [2905]			in rural areas of Gwynedd to support the social and cultural fabric of the area and contribute to the delivery of the economic objectives of the Plan.	<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
445	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	4.7	Object	KI22 should be expanded to reference the need for continued redevelopment/reconfiguration of holiday accommodation in order to maintain a product that meets visitors' expectations. Bourne Leisure is disappointed that the text at paragraph 7.60 of the Preferred Strategy has been omitted from the Spatial Profile section of the Deposit LDP. This text provides useful context with respect of the importance of tourism as an economic contributor and how it consequentially shapes the Spatial Vision and Key Issues.	<b>Not accepted</b> - KI22 refers to the need to 'improve and manage the tourism provision' and it is believed that that is sufficient. The statistical information referred to has been included at the beginning of a series of policies that will promote the development of the tourism sector.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.  <b>No change</b>
850	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	4.7	Object	Key Issues10 will not benefit communities and it will result in a decrease in facilities for the local community, especially communities with an aging population. It will lead to a greater number of people requiring to travel and more car journeys. It conflicts with Key Issue 11 "Promote opportunities for people to live healthy lives and have reasonable health care, especially in a healthy population". It is also not appropriate for one of the strategic policies under PS5 on p.75 point 4 "Promote greater self-containment of centres and villages by contributing to balanced communities that are supported by sufficient services..."	<b>Not accepted</b> - This part of the Plan lists the challenges and opportunities that face the Plan area. KI10 recognizes that education facilities and health providers are looking into rationalizing their services or acting on plans to do so. The Deposit Plan then includes a spatial strategy and policies which aim to contribute towards tackling these phenomena. It should be noted that the Deposit Plan is part of an integrated approach to tackling the issues identified.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
851	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	4.7	Object	<p>Key Issue 20 is the decline in the prosperity and vitality of town centres. This has occurred due to large supermarkets and business parks being built out of town centres. Out of town shops and offices encourage the use of cars. I suggest a policy that favours retaining shops and business in town centres and does not increase the development of business parks and supermarkets outside of towns and villages.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - This part of the Plan lists the challenges and opportunities that face the Plan area. KI20 recognizes what has been happening in town centres over the years. There are a series of policies in part 7.3 of the Deposit Plan that provide a framework for promoting town centres.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
908	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	4.7	Object	<p>Page 37. Key Issue 20 is the decline in the prosperity and vitality of town centres. This has occurred due to large supermarkets and business parks being built out of town centres . Out of town shops and offices encourage the use of cars. I suggest a policy that favours retaining shops and businesses in town centres and does not increase the development of business parks and supermarkets outside of towns and villages.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> – the matters raised by the objector are reflected in the Plan's policies about retailing as well as national planning policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Plan to address the comments made by the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					objector.  <b>No change</b>
1089	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	4.7	Support	NRW considers that the identification and review of key trends brought to the fore by the review of the strategies, plans and programmes identified in Chapter 3 has successfully identified the main issues that are to be tackled by the Joint LDP.	<b>Supportive comment noted.</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1406	Admiral Taverns [3348]	4.7	Support	Support KI6 - Our clients support the premise that the Deposit Joint LDP must deliver a sufficient and appropriate range and mix of deliverable housing in sustainable locations to meet the housing requirements of all sections of the population, support the social and cultural fabric of the area and contribute to the delivery of the economic objectives of the Plan.	<b>Supportive comment noted.</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1450	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	4.7	Object	KI22 should be expanded to reference the need for continued redevelopment/ reconfiguration of holiday accommodation in order to maintain a product that meets visitors' expectations. Significant investment is required to maintain and enhance the viability and attractiveness of existing operations as a destination, to improve their offer and to respond to changing markets, including the improvement of guest facilities and sport and leisure areas. KI22 should be amended to read: "Manage, improve and enhance the 'all year' tourist provision in the area in a sustainable way whilst at the same time promoting the heritage, the Welsh language and Welsh culture of the area.""	<b>Not accepted</b> –KI22 refers to the need to 'improve and manage the tourism provision' and it is believed that that is sufficient.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.  <b>No change</b>
1451	Bourne Leisure	4.7	Object	Bourne Leisure is disappointed that the text at paragraph	<b>Not accepted</b> – The statistical information

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Ltd [2768]			<p>7.60 of the Preferred Strategy has been omitted from the Spatial Profile section of the Deposit LDP. This text provides useful context with respect of the importance of tourism as an economic contributor and how it consequentially shapes the Spatial Vision and Key Issues. The text stated:</p> <p>"Tourism brings over £233 million into Anglesey's local economy and over £851 million into Gwynedd (including Snowdonia National Park) each year and supports over 4,000 and 15,819 local jobs, respectively".</p> <p>Bourne Leisure requests that the above text is reinstated in to the emerging LDP.</p>	<p>referred to has been included at the beginning of a series of policies that will promote the development of the tourism sector.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

#### CHAPTER 5 – VISION AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
138	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	5.2	Object	<p>It is stated "This is its vision: "Strengthen communities in Gwynedd and Anglesey." We disagree with this statement as the Plan will not strengthen rural communities and the countryside.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - Paragraph 5.2 refers to the vision of the Single Integrated Plan for Gwynedd and Anglesey which was approved by the Joint Local Services Board.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
160	Mr Aled Evans	5.2	Object	Vision to strengthen communities	<b>Not accepted</b> - It is believed that the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	[2646]			Change the allocation, and reduce the number of houses	<p>demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1103	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	5.4	Object	There is a lack of overt support in the JLDP for the Wylfa Newydd Project. Whilst the consideration for a Wylfa Newydd related development policy is recognised (in the form of PS9) it is not clear enough and does not in its current form alone enable a coherent decision making framework for associated development. Additionally the lack of clear statements in support of the Wylfa Newydd Project is not consistent with Wylfa SPG.	<p><b>Accepted</b> - The Deposit Plan recognizes the importance of Wylfa Newydd Project to Anglesey and the rest of the Plan area (as well as areas beyond that). The existence of the project and the benefits that will derive from it have been an important consideration and have informed the vision and objectives of the Plan and therefore its strategy. It is considered that adding the wording suggested by the objector will add value to this part of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the Deposit Plan to address the objector's comments.</p> <p><b>Focussed change: NF4</b></p>
357	Mr Gareth Dobson [2917]	5.5	Object	<p>There is a significant risk when basing a vision on one project that is yet to be confirmed. Historically, Wylfa or Trawsfynydd did not have a positive impact on those communities near to them - such as Amlwch in Anglesey or Ffestiniog in Gwynedd. In truth, it is arguable that both projects have hindered more suitable developments for the local communities, due to risks involving Nuclear energy.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - the demand for nuclear power stations was established by the British Government. NPS EN-6 identified as the Wylfa Newydd site as a location that may be suitable for the development of a new power station by the end of 2025. It is important that the Joint LDP prepares a local planning policy framework to support and manage important elements of the Wylfa Newydd Project. Local planning authorities will need to make decisions about several developments which will be needed to realize the development of the Wylfa Newydd site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
115	Home Builders Federation Ltd	5.6	Object	<p>A stronger reference to private housing is required, its needs to be more than just the housing needs of the</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - an appropriate level of growth forms part of the vision for</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	(Mr Mark Harris) [1470]			community. New housing is needed to serve the planned economic growth and this will bring new people into the area.  Either amend wording to bullet no. 6 or add a new bullet point.	prosperous and vibrant communities, as seen later in the strategic objectives, the strategy and policies of the Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
136	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	5.6	Object	This statement is welcomed but shouldn't the Development Plan define how this objective will be achieved. There should be more details about how this objective will be achieved.	<b>Not accepted</b> - The vision provides a snapshot of how the Plan area will look in 2026. The vision's purpose is not to give a final policy statement. Reference should be made to the strategic objectives that build on the vision as well as the policies and designations in the rest of the Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
270	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	5.6	Support	Vision (agree but uncertain about how things will work)	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No change</b>
300	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	5.6	Object	The opening paragraph of the vision should emphasis the natural environment as elsewhere in the document. Insert the word "natural" before environment	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - the word 'environment' in this case refers to both the natural environment and the built environment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
379	Mr Gareth Dobson [2917]	5.6	Object	The vision is too ambiguous - full of adjectives but not much basis. There is not enough evidence of the Authority's ability to achieve the vision in its current form.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The vision provides a snapshot of how the Plan area will look in 2026. The vision's purpose is not to give a final policy statement. Reference should be made to the strategic objectives that build on the vision as well as the policies and designations in the rest of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
849	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	5.6	Object	It is very disappointing to see that Gwynedd and Anglesey Council have a vision that includes a new nuclear power station, which has great risks as we have seen in the	<b>Not accepted</b> - the demand for nuclear power stations was established by the British Government. NPS EN-6 identified as

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				recent disaster at Fukushima. A new power station would need many major associated developments such as housing for the construction workers and infrastructure (e.g. roads, pipers and pylons). The building of the nuclear power station will affect the Welsh culture due to the influx of temporary construction workers. Nuclear power is not sustainable, it requires toxic fuel and the waste is very problematic.	<p>the Wylfa Newydd site as a location that may be suitable for the development of a new power station by the end of 2025. It is important that the Joint LDP prepares a local planning policy framework to support and manage important elements of the Wylfa Newydd Project. Local planning authorities will need to make decisions about several developments which will be needed to realize the development of the Wylfa Newydd site. Reference should be made to the strategic objectives that build on the vision as well as the policies and designations in the rest of the Plan</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
858	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	5.6	Object	The vision is broadly positively prepared and provides a good exposition of what the Plan seeks to achieve generally and within specific areas of Anglesey and Gwynedd. However, we are concerned that there is no reference to delivering sustainable development and the presumption in favour of sustainable development within the Vision, a cornerstone of Planning Policy Wales.	<b>Not accepted</b> - The vision's purpose is not to give a final policy statement. Reference should be made to the strategic objectives that build on the vision as well as the policies and designations in the rest of the Plan Together they will promote development that will mean that the Plan area is one that is sustainable economically,

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>socially and environmentally.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1104	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	5.6	Object	To give due prominence of the Wylfa Newydd Project, Horizon considers the Project should be reflected in the Vision.	<p><b>Accepted</b> - Agree that the Wylfa Newydd Project is one of the important drivers contributing towards tackling a number of issues in the Plan area, and therefore the success of the Project underpins the Plan. It is agreed that inclusion of a statement would re-inforce this and ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the wording to refer to the Project.</p> <p><b>Focused Change: NF5</b></p>
323	Sally Baxter (Ms Sally Baxter) [2883]	5.7	Object	The approach to link objectives to the Single Integrated Plan is welcomed. However, the LDP objectives do not sufficiently reflect the SIP objective of inclusive communities where residents enjoy good health and well-being. It would be helpful to emphasis this within the objectives.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - the strategic objectives build on the vision that refers to the aim to promote an area where there are "active networks of inclusive communities where residents enjoy good health and wellbeing." The strategic objectives were not prepared separately from each other</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>and should not be considered in isolation from each other. A number of strategic objectives together are an expression of the vision and they in turn are the basis for the strategic and detailed policies included in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
116	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	5.8	Object	<p>Under theme 3 reference should be made for the need to provide adequate and suitable housing to support the economic growth of the area. The plan housing targets are based on economic growth and vice versa so better cross reference to this needs to be made in the wording of the document.</p> <p>Add a Strategic Objective which states: Adequate and suitable housing will be provided to support the economic growth of the area.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – agreed that adding to the wording in SO14 to refer to the housing growth level would add to the value to the strategic aim.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – amend SO14 to refer to the need to address economic growth during the Plan period.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF7</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan.</p>
134	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy	5.8	Object	<p>Another of the Plan's strategic objectives is "To give everyone access to a home appropriate to their needs." We agree but what about existing empty houses. As far</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The purpose of the strategic objectives is to give more details about the vision, noting how the Plan seeks to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	(Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]			as we can see the intention is to create uniform estates and over-centralise in a few places rather than support natural development that responds to local needs. These estates are at the expense of development in the countryside, and the comments made under the "Population, Demographic and Housing" heading (page 35/36) that is KI.1 and KI.5 and KI.33 are supported.	<p>address this. In this respect, it is not the role of the strategic objectives to give details that are to be included in other parts of the Plan, e.g. strategic and detailed policies, or in documents of evidence, e.g. Topic Paper 3 Population and Housing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
135	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	5.8	Object	It is stated that this Plan's strategic aim is to "Maintain and create safe, healthy and active communities." According to our evidence (Housing Needs Report Llanystumdwy Community Council) 61.4% can't afford to buy a house. The only movement required is from a large house to a smaller one or large family to a larger house. By building 40 houses in Chwilog only a few local people could afford to buy them. Who therefore would be moving to them as there are no employment opportunities here? It is therefore likely that older people would go there, and this would not create an active community.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The purpose of the strategic objectives is to give more details about the vision, noting how the Plan seeks to address this. In this respect, it is not the role of the strategic objectives to give details that are to be included in other parts of the Plan, e.g. strategic and detailed policies, or in SPGs or documents of evidence, e.g. Topic Paper 3 Population and Housing, Topic Paper 17 Local Market Housing</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
276	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	5.8	Support	Strategic Objectives	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
301	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	5.8	Object	SO 16 covers a very broad range of issues; greater clarity would be achieved by separating these issues into different objectives. Natural and heritage assets should be separated to reflect the intrinsic value of the natural environment.  Replace SO 16 with two objectives 1. Protect, enhance and manage the natural assets of the Plan area, including its natural resources, wildlife habitats and its landscape character  2. Protect, enhance and manage the heritage assets of the Plan area and its landscape character and historic environment.	<b>Comment noted</b> - Agree that strategic objective SO16 includes both issues. It is not believed that this undermines the purpose of the objective. Reference should be made to how the objective has been transferred to the detailed policies of the Plan which deal with separate subjects.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
306	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	5.8	Object	Greater emphasis should be given to the protection of international and national sites in the key outputs of theme 5. Add "or damage to any of their features".	<b>Accepted</b> - Agree that adding "or damage to their features" would better explain the output.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b> – amend the third output under Theme 5 in accordance with the above.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF8</b></p> <p>To improve the clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p>
349	WYG/Alliance Planning (Mr Mark Walton) [2905]	5.8	Support	Our Client Admiral Taverns supports the strategic objective of SO14 and SO15 to deliver a sufficient and appropriate range and mix of deliverable housing sites in sustainable locations to meet the housing requirements of all sections of the population.	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
855	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	5.8	Object	There is not one overarching objective of delivering sustainable development. Planning Policy Wales (paragraph 3.1.2 and 4.2), provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development and this is at the heart of the plan making and decision taking approach of the Welsh Government. This is explained within Section 4.2 of PPW and particularly, paragraph 4.2.2. This is a very significant oversight, and on review of the policies of the Plan it is clear that the Plan does not embody the approach of the Welsh Government set out in PPW of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and Positive Planning. The presumption in favour of sustainable development should be embodied throughout the Plan.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The strategic objectives were not prepared separately from each other and should not be considered in isolation from each other. A number of strategic objectives together are an expression of the vision and they in turn are the basis for the strategic and detailed policies included in the Deposit Plan. Together they will promote development that will mean that the Plan area is one that is sustainable economically, socially and environmentally, without the need for a specific reference in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
871	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	5.8	Support	The aims and objectives of the Friends of Borth y Gest include:  "to seek to preserve the special nature of the area as a peaceful pretty seaside village set in an outstandingly beautiful rural setting". In this regard we applaud Theme 1 of the Written Statement - support and create safe, healthy, distinctive and vibrant communities, and Theme 5 - protect and enhance the natural and built environment.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1090	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	5.8	Support	It is considered that the Plans' series of Strategic Objectives set out in section 5.8 will help ensure that the Plans' vision is realised and also sets out the context for the Strategic Policies and Detailed Policies to be based upon.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1097	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	5.8	Support	It is acknowledged that Strategic Objective Theme 5 now also includes the need to protect, enhance and manage natural resources.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1105	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox)	5.8	Object	Horizon considers that it would be appropriate to include a new strategic objective under Theme 3 which supports the development of the Wylfa Newydd Project to ensure	<b>Accepted</b> - It is noted that Theme 3 and the strategic objectives and the key results together provide the framework that

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	[2919]			the JLDP contains a coherent policy framework for managing the Wylfa Newydd Project. Please also see the accompanying "Proposed Wylfa Newydd policy framework" which has been prepared to show the Wylfa Newydd specific policy framework as a whole.	<p>expresses an element of the Plan's vision which involves developing the local economy. Like many of the other strategic objectives, they provide the hooks for the policies which will promote the developments needed to address the requirements of the Wylfa Newydd Project. However, it is agreed that adding another strategic objective will strengthen this part of the Plan, ensuring its internal consistency.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – add another strategic objective under Theme 3 to refer to supporting and making the most of the opportunities that derive to the region through the Wylfa Newydd Project.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF6</b></p> <p>To ensure the clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p>
1111	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	5.8	Object	It is stated to be a key output that "no development given planning permissions will have resulted in a loss of a site of international or national nature conservation value". This wording is unduly rigid. For example the Tre'r Gof SSSI is located within the Wylfa NPS Site boundary and IACC is aware of the potential for the construction of the Wylfa Newydd Project to adversely affect it. The output sought does not allow sufficient flexibility for	<b>Not accepted</b> - Agree that in exceptions, development could lead to loss of sites of national or international nature conservation value. That would only happen after following a recognized process of assessing the proposal. It is not considered that this undermines the main result that is aimed for, which is consistent

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				changes in circumstance and does not acknowledge that there is a process whereby SSSIs can be denotified.	<p>with strategic objective SO16. Reference should be made to how the objective has been transferred to the detailed policies of the Plan which reflect statutory requirements and national planning policy, noting that it would need a clear and convincing justification or overriding interest to justify the loss of a site or adversely affect its important features.</p> <p>It is noted that the objector refers to the deletion of a SSSI. If a SSSI is deleted then the Policy wouldn't apply to the site. Therefore, it isn't clear why reference should be made to the process of deleting a site in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1407	Admiral Taverns [3348]	5.8	Support	SO14 & SO15 - Our clients support the premise that the Deposit Joint LDP must deliver a sufficient and appropriate range and mix of deliverable housing in sustainable locations to meet the housing requirements of all sections of the population, support the social and cultural fabric of the area and contribute to the delivery	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				of the economic objectives of the Plan.	

## CHAPTER 6 – THE STRATEGY

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
67	Cyngor Cymuned Llanddyfnan (Mr Graham Owen) [1378]	6.1	Object	The members also propose that Gwynedd and Anglesey councils go back to the beginning with the Joint Local Development Plan, and seriously reconsider the proposals.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
216	PAWB (Robat Idris) [2814]	6.1	Object	The Plan's precedent is flawed, as it presumes that the Wylfa B nuclear station will be built. As the strategy is flawed, the whole Plan is invalid. It is considered that the failure to build the Hinckley power station is an indicator that Wylfa B won't be built. Reference is made to the difficulties associated with getting rid of waste safely. In addition reference is made to trends to rely less on a few large providers, looking at addressing needs locally, investments in renewable energy and methods of reducing the demand for energy. Due to the uncertainty about the power station's future two plans should be formed: one to deal with a power station and the other to deal with a scenario minus a power station. This would	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - the demand for nuclear power stations was established by the British Government. NPS EN-6 identified as the Wylfa Newydd site as a location that may be suitable for the development of a new power station by the end of 2025. It is important that the Joint LDP prepares a local planning policy framework to support and manage important elements of the Wylfa Newydd Project. The Plan will need to be monitored annually and will have to be reviewed after 4 years, unless the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				avoid an excessive amount of housing being given consent in Anglesey, which would have a detrimental impact on the local communities.	<p>monitoring indicates a need for an earlier review. The monitoring and review work will record if Wylfa Newydd happens or not. If Wylfa Newydd is not built during the Plan period, the Council will need to demonstrate through the review how it will deal with that situation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
863	Bangor Civic Society (Don Mathew) [2988]	6.1	Object	<p>We believe that the Plan needs to highlight key topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* aging population: this is multi faceted and it is difficult to gather a holistic approach from the Plan;</li> <li>* children and young people - as above;</li> <li>* disabled people - as above. Wales has a higher proportion of disabled people than other nations &amp; regions of the UK and in 2010 the Welsh Government stated that disability levels (under the DDA) were one-fifth of the working population;</li> <li>* poverty alleviation - another area where Wales is under-performing &amp; which should be central to the Plan's purpose.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The types of housing units on sites, and the layout / design of the sites, are matters that will be discussed at planning application stage. This does not prohibit development for the elderly or other groups from the community. Policy TAI 1 promotes a mix of housing types and Policy TAI4 refers to residential homes, extra care housing or extra care accommodation for the elderly. The Plan includes a series of site-specific policies and criteria in part 7.3 that promote different types of employment opportunities in places that are accessible</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>to the area's communities in order to transform the local economy. Policy SP5 and Policy PCYFF2 provides the framework to look after the needs of disabled people.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1003	Cyngor Sir Ceredigion (Mrs Llinos Quelch) [1286]	6.1	Support	Having considered the Gwynedd and Anglesey Deposit LDP strategy and policies, Ceredigion County Council do not believe there is any specific policies or issues we need to comment on. The proposed strategy is broadly comparable to the Ceredigion LDP with a settlement hierarchy reflecting ours and a strategy of affordable housing contributions on a sliding scale. The deposit LDP would have no detrimental impact or conflict with the Ceredigion LDP strategy and policies and vice versa, therefore we welcome the proposed draft	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
848	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	6.3	Object	On page 46 in table 8 one of the main elements of the strategy is economic growth. Economic growth is not sustainable. I suggest that the main strategy should seek to maintain economic status.	<b>Not accepted</b> - The strategy and therefore the policies and proposals in the Deposit Plan are robust and can be realized because they are based on

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>compelling evidence and have been considered against the Sustainability Assessment and national planning policies and guidance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
133	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	6.4	Object	<p>We support the comment "promote prosperous and sustainable communities that support local services including the provision of additional housing and related development proportionate to local requirement." The conclusions of the "Housing Need Assessment of Llanystumdwy Community Council" are commensurate with local need and confirms there is no need for the type of development proposed for Chwilog in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Demand for new housing units found in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of development scale. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development. It was developed after consideration of Sustainability Assessment and national planning policies and guidance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
128	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	6.5	Object	It is stated "It sets a level of growth considered to represent the most robust, balanced and appropriate approach taking into account all relevant factors, including work undertaken by independent housing and economic forecasts." We disagree, again on the basis of the Housing Needs Report for the Llanystumdwy Community Council Area.	<b>Not accepted</b> - Demand for new housing units found in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of development scale. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development. It was developed after consideration of Sustainability Assessment and national planning policies and guidance.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
278	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	6.5	Object	Strategy  The evidence I have seen does not support the	<b>Comment noted</b> - The evidence base shown in a series of Topic Papers, Background Papers, as well as documents



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				propositions here.	<p>published by others have informed the Plan. The requirements that were identified are reflected in the policies and designations of the Deposit Plan. It is therefore considered that compelling evidence has been used to inform the structure and content of the Plan and, where appropriate to do so, the Plan refers to the relevant background documents.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
834	Cyngor Cymuned Tudweiliog (Mrs Glenys Peters) [1236]	6.8	Object	Villages not included on the list should be considered in accordance with local need.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1029	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	6.8	Object	<p>Further justification is required to explain the number of villages included within this policy. Some of these clusters have scored very low in the sustainability matrix included in topic paper 5 (Developing the Settlement Hierarchy). The lower scores suggest that these are less sustainable, isolated developments, and not well connected to services and facilities, hence the need to explain why these have been identified. The Welsh Government objects to the identification of so many 'clusters' which lack justification.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> - The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages that have a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy. It is important that the spatial strategy recognizes that the area is very rural and is one that includes a network of different scattered settlements. The Council has sought to ensure that future development is located in places where there is access to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>public transport. The clusters that have been identified are those where residents can access services and facilities in settlements which are higher up in the Settlement Hierarchy without using the car. Identifying the Clusters will also contribute to sustaining communities where the Welsh language is strong. In spatial terms, the strategy will ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote development on an appropriate scale that addresses the expectations of the Strategic Vision and Objectives of the Plan.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council believes that the Cluster category in an area which is very rural in nature will promote a small percentage of the growth to small settlements, addressing the social aspect of the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that there is a need to explain how the clusters were identified and this will be done by adding to Topic Paper 5.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no need to change the Deposit</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					Plan to respond to this objection, but reference should be made to the amended Topic Paper 5.  <b>No change</b>
403	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	6.10	Support	Support.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1093	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	6.10	Support	NRW is satisfied with the strategy's aim to disperse development proportionately around the plan area. The focus being on locating development within those locations that provide the best opportunity for achieving sustainable development i.e. developing the Sub regional, urban and local service centres, and an appropriate amount of development in villages with a focus on service villages and then some development in Clusters.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
302	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	6.11	Object	The last sentence should emphasis the themes elsewhere in the plan of protecting the natural environment. Replace the word "countryside" in the last sentence with "natural environment".	<b>Accepted</b> - Agree that the inclusion of "natural environment" in this part of the Plan will help to maintain internal consistency of the Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b> – amend the sentence by adding “natural environment” instead of “countryside”.  <b>Focussed Change: NF9</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					In order to ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.
856	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	6.13	Object	Paragraph 6.13 refers to the Urban Capacity Study of the Centres which looked to reuse where possible and as a priority suitable developed brownfield land. However, this study was solely confined to existing urban centres. It ignored, the large derelict, decaying and contaminated former Dynamic Friction Site. However, in sustainability terms the site is located in close proximity to Caernarfon. Is well served by existing bus routes, and a 5 minute journey to the bus station and connected to Caernarfon by a good quality cycle route a 10 minute cycle. There is also a pavement from the site to Caernarfon. The site is previously developed land, contaminated and occupied by a substantial concrete and steel structure that dominates the site and the wider surrounding area - see site specific objections.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - In preparing the Plan attention was paid to the requirements of national policy in PPW. This document advises local planning authorities to direct development to sustainable locations, including consideration of previously used land and buildings inside settlements first, then extensions to settlements and finally new development around settlements with good public transport links. The methodology used in the Urban Capacity Study was developed with this in mind.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1674	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	6.14	Object	Site Assessment Methodology - For this assessment to be effective, the authorities will need to clarify exactly how much of the site is BMV and how it has influenced decisions regarding uses on such lands.	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - When selecting sites for inclusion the Councils tried to identify the agricultural quality of the sites and information was obtained from the Department of Environment and the Welsh Government's Natural</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>Environment and Agriculture Department. Consideration was given to the requirements of national planning policy and the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment. Priority was also given to finding sites and previously used buildings within the settlements. Where it is necessary to extend settlements, priority was given to land in the lower categories unless there was clear and convincing justification for not doing so, e.g. because directing development to sites in lower categories is contrary to the Plan's spatial strategy. By acting in this manner, it is believed that the Council has minimized the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that there is scope to improve how the information is presented. Reference is made to Topic Paper 1A which provides key information about Plan allocations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – There is no need to change the Deposit Plan to respond to this objection, but reference should be made to the amended Topic Paper.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No change</b>
404	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	6.17	Support	Para 6.17. The Company does not wish to see extended the development boundary on the northern side of Porthmadog.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1112	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	6.19	Object	Refers to "Habitats Regulation Appraisal" which is a typographical error and should refer to "Habitats Regulation Assessment" ("HRA"). In any event this text should be clear as to what steps of HRA have been undertaken (i.e. screening, appropriate assessment etc.).	<b>Accepted in part</b> – Agree that the English version of the Deposit Plan does not include the correct name.  This paragraph from section 6 of the Plan identifies the assessments that have informed the decision to direct the growth that would otherwise have gone to Porthmadog. It is not appropriate to include details of these assessments in this part of the Plan. The reports on the assessments will provide the relevant information. Therefore, there is no need to amend the Plan in response to this part of the objection.  <b>Recommendation</b> – correct the English version of the Plan to note "Habitat Regulation Assessment" to ensure accuracy.  <b>Minor Change: NB1</b>  To ensure accuracy.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
873	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	6.20	Object	The supportive text to 6.20 is noted and support the drawing of development boundaries tight up to the actual edge of settlements. Our objection seeks modification to provide clarification and consistency in the plan. We are concerned that the definition of development boundaries refers to "sub regional Centre, Urban Service Centre, Local Service Centres and villages". We note that in the formal policies of the written statement there is no category called villages, but categories called "local villages" and "coastal/ rural villages". The text would benefit from clarifying that the development boundaries apply to all of these villages.	<p><b>Accepted</b> - Agree that including wording which indicates that several types of 'villages' have been identified in the Plan will improve clarity and ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Correct the second sentence in paragraph 6.20 to refer to local villages, rural villages and coastal villages.</p> <p><b>Minor Change NB1</b></p> <p>In order to ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.</p>
909	Tom Brooks [3034]	6.20	Object	I support the drawing of development boundaries tight up to the actual edge of settlement construction. This objection seeks modification to provide clarification and consistency in the plan. I am concerned that the definition of development boundaries refers to "Sub-Regional Centre, Urban Service Centre, Local Services Centres and villages". I note that in the formal policies of the written statement there is no category called villages but categories called "local villages" and "coastal/ rural villages". For avoidance of doubt, the text would benefit from clarifying that development boundaries apply to all of these categories of villages.	<p><b>Accepted</b> - Agree that including wording which indicates that several types of 'villages' have been identified in the Plan will improve clarity and ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Correct the second sentence in paragraph 6.20 to refer to local villages, rural villages and coastal villages.</p> <p><b>Minor Change NB1</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					In order to ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.
1434 1455	Cyngor Tref Penrhyddeudraeth (Mr Glyn Roberts) [1261] Cyng/Counc Gareth Thomas [402]	6.24	Object	The proposed strategies and proposals aren't based on a credible evidence base in accordance with Test of Soundness CE2. There are inconsistencies and contradictions and an inability to realise the significance of the statistics. There are statements in the Language Impact Assessment about Penrhyddeudraeth that are absolutely astray. Also where reference is made to the proportion of Penrhyddeudraeth's residents able to speak Welsh, the third bullet point states that 74.8% are able to, which is 4.8% higher than the threshold, but in the Conclusions section it is noted that the percentages are as follows, 76.5% and 6.5%. Which is correct?	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> - The evidence base shown in a series of Topic Papers, Background Papers, as well as documents published by others have informed the Plan. The requirements that were identified are reflected in the policies and designations of the Deposit Plan. It is therefore considered that compelling evidence has been used to inform the structure and content of the Plan and, where appropriate to do so, the Plan refers to the relevant background documents.</p> <p>Agree that the relevant part of the report about the Language Impact Assessment needs to be corrected to ensure compatibility. Reference should be made to the amended report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan. Agree to correct the appropriate part of the report about the Language Impact Assessment, which is published</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					separately to the plan.  <b>No change</b>
1429	Cyngor Tref Penrhyddeudraeth (Mr Glyn Roberts) [1261]	6.25	Object	The planning culture insists that species of creatures and plants that have been under siege and some types of buildings have to be treated with care and respect in case of further damage by building and engineering plans etc. In complete contrast, the planning regime is prevented from giving the same consideration and respect to the Welsh language. Although it also is under heavy siege and retreating, it is forced outside the planning culture. It should be included within the planning culture and defended by statutory means. With this in mind, house building should be according to the needs of our communities only not according to the projections system.	<b>Comment noted</b> - In accordance with national planning policy and guidelines, careful consideration was given throughout the process of preparing the Plan to the needs and interests of the Welsh language in order to ensure the Plan contributes to its well being. The Sustainability Assessment of the Plan includes the need to promote development that maintain or strengthen the Welsh language within the framework of sustainability. The requirements of Sections 11 and 31 of the Planning (Wales) Act have given statutory status to the Welsh language.  Demand for new housing units found in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of development scale. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development. It was developed after consideration of Sustainability

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>Assessment and national planning policies and guidance. Reference should be made to the range of strategic and detailed policies that will support the Plan to contribute to the well being of the Welsh language.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1436	Cyng/Counc Gareth Thomas [402]	6.25	Object	<p>There is a feeling that the Welsh language is under heavy siege and under retreat, and there is a feeling that the planning procedure and culture doesn't consider it important. With this in mind, house building should only address the needs of our local communities and not in accordance with the projections system, which conflicts with this.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - - In accordance with national planning policy and guidelines, careful consideration was given throughout the process of preparing the Plan to the needs and interests of the Welsh language in order to ensure the Plan contributes to its well being. The Sustainability Assessment of the Plan includes the need to promote development that maintain or strengthen the Welsh language within the framework of sustainability. The requirements of Sections 11 and 31 of the Planning (Wales) Act have given statutory status to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>the Welsh language.</p> <p>Demand for new housing units found in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of development scale. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development. It was developed after consideration of Sustainability Assessment and national planning policies and guidance. Reference should be made to the range of strategic and detailed policies that will support the Plan to contribute to the well being of the Welsh language.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1113	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah	6.26	Object	There is insufficient support for the Wylfa Newydd Project in the Plan. Support for the Wylfa Newydd	<b>Accepted</b> – the Deposit Plan refers to the importance of Wylfa Newydd to Anglesey

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Fox) [2919]			Project, as the biggest driver of the economic transformation sought, should be included within these paragraphs.	<p>and the wider area a number of times, including in this paragraph. Nonetheless it is agreed that additional wording in accordance with the objector's suggestion would re-inforce this.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>For clarity the text will be amended accordingly.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF11, NF12</b></p>
1114	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	6.28	Object	<p>There is insufficient support for the Wylfa Newydd Project in the Plan.</p> <p>Support for the Wylfa Newydd Project, as the biggest driver of the economic transformation sought, should be included within these paragraphs.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Although it was not intended that the sentence should include a full list of people the Council will be working with, it is agreed that adding a reference to 'project promoters' provides a fuller picture.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add 'project promoters' to the list of people the Council will work with in order to improve clarity.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF3</b></p>
203	John Brinley Jones [2087]	6.31	Object	It is also vital that business owners that create employment and wealth in the area are encouraged to move into the area or if they require a home in the area and have a plot that they should not be subjected to very	<b>Not accepted</b> – Demand for new housing units found in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of development scale. It gives a figure which

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>stringent affordable sized dwellings since they may require additional facilities within their homes such as office space or areas where they could work from home.</p> <p>To consider each planning application on merit rather than have a blanket policy that obviously can't meet all requirements.</p> <p>To consider each planning application on merit rather than have a blanket policy that obviously can't meet all requirements.</p>	<p>is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
214	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	6.40	Object	It is not considered clear why the housing figure has been chosen as it does not fit with any of the scenarios tested (a point stated in the Councils own documents). The figure does also not appear to include a 4% vacancy rate allowance which is required for the normal operation of the housing market. Also the figure for Gwynedd is below the 2011 projection figure which goes against the	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>advice of Carl Sargeant AM who advises they should be the starting point.</p> <p>Further clarification required on the option chosen. Increase the housing requirement figure to 7471 to take account of the 4% vacancy rate. Explain why the Gwynedd housing requirement is below the 2011 Housing projection figure.</p>	<p>difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The process of converting the total</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>number of households to the total number of housing units has addressed the scale of vacant units, higher than 4%.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
117	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	6.41	Object	<p>No reference is made to an allowance for empty properties. It is generally been accepted at recent LDP's that a 4% allowance should be made for this, as the market needs a certain level of empty properties to operate. There is however a difference between long term empty properties which can be addressed by a Council policy and short term vacancies.</p> <p>Include reference to empty properties and vacancy rates and increase housing number to 8189.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> - The 2011 Census gives a figure of 12.2% for Gwynedd and 10.5% for Anglesey regarding the existence of empty houses. This level has been applied to all the statistical scenarios and has been recorded in the Background Paper on population projections, households and housing.</p> <p>It is agreed that adding a reference to this information in the Deposit Plan and in Topic Paper 4A will help to improve understanding of the total of housing units.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend paragraph 6.40 to refer to the</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>empty housing allowance and add to Topic Paper 4A accordingly.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF13</b></p>
293	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	6.42	Object	<p>The HBF believe that more of the housing requirement should be provided by the Sub-regional and the Urban Service Centres. As this would make the plan more sustainable and respond to market demand. Increase the number of houses provided in the Sub-regional and the Urban Service Centres. This can be done by allocating more sites which would also provide the additional number suggested in comments on other parts of the plan.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is important that the spatial strategy recognizes that the area is very rural and is one that includes a network of different scattered settlements. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms, the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It is going to ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
118	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	6.43	Object	<p>Concern is raised at the heavy reliance on previous consented sites. Many of these have had consent for some time and there may be reasons other than the market why these have not delivered. Has any assessment of the likely hood of these to deliver have been made. This is backed up by this year's JHLAS for each area which identified a number of sites which had been in over 5 years and many more that had proved a start on site to keep the consent alive or just renewed the consent.</p> <p>Reduce the reliance on existing consented sites and allocate more new sites which can be proved to be deliverable.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Council believes that the designated sites are consistent with the Plan's strategy and that they can produce housing within the period of the Plan in order to meet demand up to 2026. Information that is contained in the Housing Land Study has informed the Plan. The Home Builders Federation Ltd is one of the partners who have agreed to the analysis contained in the reports on the annual studies. Not all the sites which have planning permission have been included in the Plan because evidence suggests that they will not be developed within the period of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
896	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	6.43	Object	<p>Paragraph 6.43 confirms that approximately 50% of the housing requirement is to be provided via existing commitments and planning permissions. However, there is no certainty that all those permissions and commitments will be delivered. Many planning permissions and existing commitments are not delivered for a wide range of reasons including third party land, access, site constraints, land value, lack of market, restrictive S106 agreement requirements etc. Information about each site should be provided and each site should be assessed not simply rolled forward as a commitment on an unquestioned basis. It is also unclear what level of housing committed and proposed will be on greenfield and previously developed sites.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Council believes that the sites designated are consistent with the Plan's strategy and that they can produce housing within the period of the Plan in order to meet demand up to 2026. Information that is contained in the Housing Land Study has informed the Plan. Not all the sites which have planning permission have been included in the Plan because evidence suggests that they will not be developed within the period of the Plan.</p> <p>The Plan distributes development in accordance with the Settlement Hierarchy and the capacity of settlements to cope with the growth.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
204	John Brinley Jones [2087]	6.45	Object	<p>It is vital that business owners that create employment and wealth in the area are encouraged to move into the area or if they require a home in the area and have a plot that they should not be subjected to very stringent</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Demand for new housing units found in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of development scale. It gives a figure which</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>affordable sized dwellings since they may require additional facilities within their homes such as office space or areas where they could work from home.</p> <p>To consider each planning application on merit rather than have a blanket policy that obviously can't meet all requirements.</p>	<p>is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

CHAPTER 7.1 SAFE, HEALTHY, DISTINCTIVE AND VIBRANT COMMUNITIES

Welsh Language and Culture

PS1 – Welsh Language and Culture

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
763	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	7.1.1	Object	CPRW agrees that support to communities should be given emphasis, including in particular primacy to policies to preserve and promote Welsh language and culture. CPRW is concerned that most of the other 'community' policies covered relate to the provision of physical infrastructure including roads. Whilst these are relevant they do not address a perception that a trend towards greater centralisation of planning policies and decisions is reducing the influence small rural communities have over their local living conditions and development, that genuine local consultation is weak and that local representation through community councils is ineffective. More attention is required to mechanisms for increasing the influence of small rural communities over their living conditions and development.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Deposit Plan was prepared following several public participation and consultation periods, which provided an opportunity for communities to express their views. Forcing community councils to contribute to public consultations is a matter which is beyond of remit of the Plan preparation process.</p> <p>The Plan provides a set of policies and proposals that will form the basis for assessing a range of developments during the Plan period. It is believed that they will promote development which will benefit rural communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
72	Cyngor Tref Nefyn (Liz Saville Roberts) [2710]	PS1	Support	It is approved that PS1 noted that it is possible to refuse proposals based on their potential to cause significant harm to the character and balance of a community's language. The results of the 2011 Census regarding changes in a community's language profile should be considered as evidence when coming to an opinion about proposals' potential to change linguistic character. An impact on Welsh language communities should be a firm planning consideration in Gwynedd and beyond.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b> – The settlement profiles that will be published as an additional Topic Paper at the submission stage will note the 2011 Census results. The information can be updated at appropriate times as more current information about the settlements becomes available.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
73	Adran Cynllunio a Thai, Cyngor Sir Ddinbych (Angela Loftus) [2719]	PS1	Support	Support the inclusion of a policy within the Plan.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
125	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr	PS1	Support	2 states that proposals that cause significant harm to the character and linguistic balance of communities	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Richard J Roberts) [1550]			due to their size, scale or location will be refused and 4 promotes the use of welsh place names for new development, house names and street names. We fully support these policies.	<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
127	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	PS1	Object	<p>Point 2 is considered over onerous and requires further clarification. Such impact would need to be tested and assessed this would normally be done through some form of 'impact assessment'. The policy should instead set thresholds above which an assessment is required. The words 'size &amp; scale' need to be quantified. In setting a threshold for residential development care needs to be taken to not set it too low as this will discourage smaller builders due to the extra work and cost associated with new development.</p> <p>Delete point 2 or reword to provide clarification as above.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> - The Welsh language has been considered when formulating the strategy and policies of the Plan, and the possible effects of the Plan on the Welsh language have been assessed throughout the Sustainability Assessment process, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>It is believed that quantifying the words 'size, scale and location' would ensure that the policy is more transparent. The proposed SPG provides guidance as to the Council's expectations regarding providing information when thresholds are reached. The aim is to prepare an initial draft of the CCA by the time of the EIP hearings.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the policy's criteria to refer to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>specific thresholds.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF15, NF19, NF21</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p>
279	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	PS1	Object	<p>The Welsh language</p> <p>Restrict large developments in general</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan’s policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					Plan.  <b>No change</b>
339	Miss Ffion Jones [2856]	PS1	Object	<p>It is said that the Council will refuse proposals that would, due to its scale, size or location, cause significant harm to the character and balance of a community's language. It is intended to build large estates in our local villages and towns. Without a doubt, this will change the character and balance of a community's language. Without conducting proper research, who knows who will buy these new houses - and more importantly, who can afford to buy them? The salaries of local young people are very low, and many struggle to get mortgages. Filling the new estates with non-Welsh speaking migrants will most certainly have a detrimental impact on our communities and language.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No change</b>
392	Dr Richard Roberts [2938]	PS1	Object	<p>The 'SO1 Protecting and strengthening the Welsh language' cannot be reconciled with a housing target of 7902 (which is based on migration) in the light of naturally static population growth projections and in light of the language results of the 2011 Census. The likely harmful impacts of the JLDP on the Welsh language can be honestly noted, expanding on the acceptance of those harmful impacts due to the priority given to any other strategic objective. That would estimate a more sophisticated evaluation of priorities in a real situation (it is naively suggested in the deposit version of the JLDP that all the objectives correspond with each other). Another option would be to reconsider the number of houses that are suggested to be built during the plan period.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
793	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew)	PS1	Support	Policy PS1 is supported.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	[2988]				<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
794	Tom Brooks [3034]	PS1	Support	<p>I support PS1 on Welsh Language and Culture especially where it records "The Councils will promote and support the use of the Welsh Language in the Plan area. This will be achieved by:</p> <p>1. Using appropriate mechanisms to ensure that suitable measures that mitigate negative impacts are provided or a contribution is made towards them"</p>	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
797	Cyngor Cymuned Botwnnog (Mrs Gwenda Roberts) [1541]	PS1	Object	<p>The Plan states that everything needs to be bilingual. Shouldn't this be 'in Welsh' or bilingual. It must be remembered that we are in the Welsh language stronghold in the Llyn Peninsular.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The comment is noted. Wales is a bilingual country with two official languages. The Policy recognizes the standards expected of public bodies, and encourages private commercial businesses to give the same status to the Welsh language on their signs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No change</b>
800	Jina Gwyrfai [3092]	PS1	Object	<p>Promotion of the language as a basic principle? At the same time reference is made to 'mitigate negative effects'. These principles don't align. The language used isn't strong enough - 'encourage' bilingual signs, 'use of Welsh place names'. Using 'encourage' isn't robust enough. The conclusion is that the Welsh language isn't an important part of the Deposit Plan. No robust evidence is provided to demonstrate your real concern for the Welsh language. Using the Welsh language must be mandatory, working with the Language Commissioner to require Welsh names and signs, language impact assessment should be mandatory, every development for local people i.e. affordable.</p>	<p><b>Partially accepted</b> - The Welsh language has been considered when formulating the strategy and policies of the Plan, and the possible effects of the Plan on the Welsh language have been assessed throughout the Sustainability Assessment process, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>The proposed SPG provides guidance as to the Council's expectations regarding providing information when thresholds are reached. The aim is to prepare an initial draft of the CCA by the time of the EIP hearings.</p> <p>It is agreed that strengthening the wording provides more certainty about the Councils' expectations as regards using bilingual signs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - Amend the criteria to note 'ensure' instead of 'encourage'.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Focussed Change NF15, NF16, NF19, NF21</b></p> <p>To improve the clarity of the Plan.</p>
874	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	PS1	Support	SO1 seeks to "safeguard and strengthen the Welsh language and culture and promote its use as an essential part of community life." We support PS1 especially where it records "The Councils will promote and support the use of the Welsh language in the Plan area. This will be achieved by: 1) using appropriate mechanisms to ensure that suitable measures that mitigate negative impacts are provided or a contribution is made towards them."	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
885	Mr John Tripp [252]	PS1	Object	Remember need to protect the language. Not enough done. Link to Local Agenda 21.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - In line with the Single Integrated Plan, the Welsh language has been considered when formulating the strategy and policies of the Plan, and the possible effects of the Plan on the Welsh language have been assessed throughout the Sustainability Assessment process, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
937	Cyng/Counc Alwyn Gruffydd [381]	PS1	Object	<p>The Strategic Policy is to be welcomed, but there is a need to look at the Plan in a more coherent way to ensure that this policy is implemented to ensure that other elements of the plan, such as the policy on housing numbers, does not militate against it.</p> <p>Due to the unique nature of the county the Welsh language has to be an important consideration in the planning process. I believe that the development boundaries need extending in order to defend the language and our communities.</p>	<p><b>Partially accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>It is believed that quantifying the words 'size, scale and location' would ensure that the policy is more transparent. The proposed SPG provides guidance as to the Council's expectations regarding providing information when thresholds are reached. The aim is to prepare an initial draft of the CCA by the time of the EIP hearings.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the policy's criteria to refer to specific thresholds.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF15, NF16, NF19, NF21</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p>
955 958	Menter Môn (Helen Thomas) [1615] Hunaniaith (Debbie A. Williams Jones) [3037]	PS1	Object	<p>The Strategic Policy is to be welcomed, but the Plan should be looked at in a more coordinated way to ensure that this policy is implemented to make certain that there are no other elements of the plan, such as the housing numbers policy, that militate against it.</p> <p>Due to the unique nature of the County there is a need for the Welsh language to be an important consideration in the planning system. Believe it is necessary to extend the boundaries to defend the Welsh language and vitality and viability of the Welsh language in the communities of Anglesey and Gwynedd. The Deposit Plan needs to reflect the fact that the Welsh language is a horizontal theme</p>	<p><b>Partially accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>It is believed that quantifying the words 'size, scale and location' would ensure that the policy is more transparent. The proposed SPG provides guidance as to the Council's expectations regarding</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>throughout the whole Plan. Clarity is required over how it is intended to protect the Welsh language.</p>	<p>providing information when thresholds are reached. The aim is to prepare an initial draft of the CCA by the time of the EIP hearings.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan’s policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p>However, it is believed that there are grounds to make some focussed changes to better highlight how the Plan promotes development, which, jointly with other measures, will be in the interests of the Welsh language. Note also the content of the background documents relevant to the Welsh language.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the Policy criteria to refer to specific thresholds to ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p> <p>Amend the wording to better highlight</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>the way it is intended to safeguard the Welsh language.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF15, NF16, NF19, NF21</b></p> <p>To ensure the clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p>
1115	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	PS1	Object	<p>Horizon considers that in the absence of the SPG (cited as forthcoming in paragraph 7.1.4), it is unclear how this policy test will be applied. As currently drafted, this element of the Strategic Policy may risk becoming a barrier to economic growth and other aspirations in the Plan. Horizon submits that the paragraph needs to be amended to build in further flexibility and clarify, among other things, what is meant by "significant harm", the factors relevant to assessing potential harm, and how other policy objectives in the Plan will be weighed against this policy objective.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> - The Welsh language has been considered when formulating the strategy and policies of the Plan, and the possible effects of the Plan on the Welsh language have been assessed throughout the Sustainability Assessment process, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>It is believed that quantifying the words 'size, scale and location' would ensure that the policy is more transparent. The proposed SPG provides guidance as to the Council's expectations regarding providing information when thresholds are reached. The aim is to prepare an initial draft of the CCA by the time of the EIP hearings.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the policy's criteria to refer to specific thresholds.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF15, NF16, NF19, NF21</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p>
1432	Cyngor Tref Penrhyddeudraeth (Mr Glyn Roberts) [1261]	PS1	Object	<p>Penrhyndeudraeth Town Council is of the opinion that the Plan's approach to the community strategy (Test of Soundness C4) isn't beneficial to this community, that is: if the houses that are built aren't bought by the centre's residents, there is every chance that the developers will sell them to anyone they wish, e.g. migrants, which would mean another reduction in the proportion of Welsh speakers.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>provision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1438	Cyngor Gwynedd (Cyng/Counc Gareth Thomas) [402]	PS1	Object	<p>I am of the opinion that the consideration given in this Plan to the community strategy (Test of Soundness C4) is beneficial to this community, that is:</p> <p>If the housing that are built aren't bought by the residents of the centre, there is every possibility that the builder will sell them to whoever he wishes, e.g. migrants, which would mean another reduction in the proportion of Welsh speakers.</p> <p>Therefore, no housing should be built other than to meet local need that is the community of Penrhyndeudraeth.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
107	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	7.1.4	Support	WG's recommendation to consider the impact on the Welsh language in Bangor. Work completed looking at wards across Gwynedd, therefore looking at Hirael but not at Bangor as an entity. Need detailed research on the language and planning in Bangor in order to give information to the planning process, as well as the impact on the Welsh language.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
120	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	7.1.4	Object	It is stated that the Welsh language will be promoted through various policies in the Plan. Which policies are these? Why aren't they listed? It is also further stated that a Supplementary Planning Guidance will be published to provide further guidance about the matter. We consider that this guidance should be an operational part of the original Plan.	<b>Accepted in part</b> - Attention should be paid to Table 7 in part 5 of the Plan, which provides a list of relevant policies that will support the individual aims. Nonetheless, it agreed that this part of the Plan would benefit from an amendment to improve clarity. SPGs do not form part of development plans.  <b>Recommendation</b>  Amend the paragraph preceding the Policy to provide an overview of other policies.  <b>Focused change NF14</b>

## Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

### Introduction

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations
1433	Cyngor Tref Penrhyddeudraeth (Mr Glyn Roberts) [1261]	7.1.5	Object	<p>The existing network/ infrastructure in Penrhyndedruaeth and Minffordd, e.g. roads, parking, family medical services, is under pressure. Because</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* There is no additional land nearby to extend the existing school;</li> <li>* An increase in the number of patients would add to the pressure on family practitioners, which is already considerable;</li> <li>* As there will be a considerable increase in traffic through Penrhyndeudraeth when Pont Briwet is completed this will definitely slow vehicle movement along the highway through the village, they shouldn't be expected to be able to accommodate 152 new housing. Accommodating 59 will be more than sufficient.</li> </ul> <p>The Regulations that allow authorities to charge developers to use money to provide a range of infrastructure is irrelevant in the above context.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Strategic Policy PS2 ensures that the provision of sufficient infrastructure will be expected to make a proposal acceptable. Furthermore, Policy ISA1 ensures that where the essential infrastructure cannot be provided on site, financial contributions to get essential infrastructure off site will be requested by the developer.</p> <p>In addition, Indicator D8 for Theme 1 in the monitoring framework ensures that the Plan will monitor any issues arising on sites that have been allocated in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1454	Cyngor Gwynedd (Cyng/Counc Gareth Thomas) [402]				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations
1118 1119 1120	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	7.1.7 & 7.1.8 & 7.1.9	Object	<p>Horizon considers the clarity of these paragraphs should be improved.</p> <p>The Councils' position on how it will manage pooling restrictions going forward after 6 April 2015 should be set out in full as this is critical for developers including Horizon to understand.</p> <p>Horizon makes further representations on the terminology surrounding and use of CIL receipts, section 106 agreements and community benefits in relation to Policies PS2 and ISA1.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is agreed that these paragraphs should be amended as suggested to add clarity and accuracy to the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend paragraphs 7.1.8-7.1.10 to set out the pooling restrictions with regards to CIL.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF17</b></p>
416	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	7.1.9	Object	<p>Careful consideration needs to be given to the potential adverse impact of CIL on the viability of new development such as the Company might propose in accordance with Candidate Site submissions refs: SP552 and SP870 (copies of forms attached).</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p>Introduction of a CIL regime is a voluntary measure and will only be introduced if there is robust evidence to demonstrate that the local market is viable. The Councils will undertake the required research during 2016 – 2017. In the meantime, and if the market proves to be unviable, the Councils will continue to seek relevant contributions via Section 106 Agreements where they meet the statutory tests set out in the CIL Regulations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations
					<p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

**PS2 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
144	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS2	Object	<p>There is no definition of what development will be subject to what planning obligations.</p> <p>Given the specific characteristics of mineral extraction. Minerals development should not be subject to CIL.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Once the infrastructure required to enable a scheme to proceed (such as access and servicing) has been addressed, the priorities given to the provision of different types of infrastructure and community benefits will vary depending upon a number of factors.</p> <p>The SPG on Planning Obligations will provide more detailed information regarding thresholds and formulas that will be used to determine matters specific to different types of development.</p> <p>Introduction of a CIL regime is a voluntary measure and will only be introduced if there is robust evidence to demonstrate</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>that the local market is viable. The Councils will undertake the required research during 2016 – 2017. In the meantime, and if the market proves to be unviable, the Councils will continue to seek relevant contributions via Section 106 Agreements where they meet the statutory tests set out in the CIL Regulations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
119	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS2	Object	<p>Delete the second sentence as this is not needed in the policy and should be in the supporting text. When referring to commuted sums this also needs to refer to adoption as one can not have one without the other.</p> <p>Essential Infrastructure' needs to be defined. There needs to be clarity between infrastructure such as services and roads which are essential and other developer contributions as listed in policy ISA1 which should be negotiated based on the impact/ viability of the scheme not 'expected'.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that reference to possible maintenance payments should be included in the policy to ensure clarity and to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.</p> <p>Agree that second part of the policy could benefit from minor editing to improve clarity.</p> <p>The SPG on Planning Obligations will</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>provide more detailed information regarding thresholds and formulas that will be used to determine matters specific to different types of development</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend Policy to reflect the need to address the possible requirement for different types of infrastructure to enable a scheme to proceed instead of 'essential infrastructure'</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF18</b></p>
145	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS2	Object	<p>There is no definition of what development will be subject to what planning obligations.</p> <p>Given the specific characteristics of mineral extraction, Minerals development should not be subject to CIL.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Once the infrastructure required to enable a scheme to proceed (such as access and servicing) has been addressed, the priorities given to the provision of different types of infrastructure and community benefits will vary depending upon a number of factors.</p> <p>The SPG on Planning Obligations will provide more detailed information regarding thresholds and formulas that will be used to determine matters specific to different types of development</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>Introduction of a CIL regime is a voluntary measure and will only be introduced if there is robust evidence to demonstrate that the local market is viable. The Councils will undertake the required research during 2016 – 2017. In the meantime, and if the market proves to be unviable, the Councils will continue to seek relevant contributions via Section 106 Agreements where they meet the statutory tests set out in the CIL Regulations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1088	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS2	Object	<p>NRW wish to highlight that there is uncertainty as to whether there will be adequate water resource capacity during the operation of the proposed Wylfa Newydd. The requirements to increase water capacity has the potential for environmental impacts. Your Authority should be aware of the potential need for the LDP's focus changes or monitoring of the plan to take into consideration any updated information</p>	<p><b>Note comment</b></p> <p>Consideration will be given to the water resource capacity as part of the application for the Development Consent Order for the Wylfa Newydd project.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				provided by Horizon with regards to water capacity requirements.	objector's representation.  <b>No change</b>
1122	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS2	Object	The Councils' intention with regard to the extent of these policies is not clear. The amendments made make it clear that s106 obligations sought must be levied in accordance with the regulatory tests i.e. contributions must meet the Community Infrastructure Regulations 2010 regulation 122 tests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· * necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms;</li> <li>· * directly related to the development; and,</li> <li>· * fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.</li> </ul> These policies should be reconsidered to make this clear.	<b>Accepted</b>  It is agreed that the suggested amendment will add clarity and accuracy to the policy in accordance with the regulations.  <b>Recommendation</b>  Amend the policy to refer to the possible requirement for statutory payments.  <b>Focussed Change NF18</b>

#### ISA1 – Infrastructure Provision

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
146	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	Policy ISA1	Object	There is no definition of what development will be subject to what planning obligations.	<b>Not accepted</b>  The SPG on Planning Obligations will provide more detailed information
147	Ellesmere Sand &			Given the specific characteristics of mineral	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
	Gravel Company Limited [2686]			extraction. Minerals development should not be subject to CIL.	<p>regarding what types of development will be subject to what planning obligations. Introduction of a CIL regime is a voluntary measure and will only be introduced if there is robust evidence to demonstrate that the local market is viable. The Councils will undertake the required research during 2016 – 2017. In the meantime, and if the market proves to be unviable, the Councils will continue to seek relevant contributions via Section 106 Agreements where they meet the statutory tests set out in the CIL Regulations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
303	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	Policy ISA1	Support	We welcome the inclusion of nature conservation in the list of purposes for which contributions may be sought.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
439	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham	Policy ISA1	Object	Careful consideration needs to be given to the adverse impact any requirement for	<b>Partly Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
	Farr) [254]			developer contributions may have on the viability of new development such as the Company might propose in accordance with Candidate Site submissions refs: SP552 and SP870 (copies of forms attached). Delete sentence 'Where proposals ... must be funded by the proposal.'	<p>Where the deliverability of a development may be compromised by the scale of planning obligations and other costs, a viability assessment may be necessary. This should be informed by the particular circumstances of the site and proposed development in question. Assessing the viability of a particular site requires more detailed analysis than at plan level. It is agreed that this should be clarified in the explanation to the Policy.</p> <p>Further guidance will be included in the SPG on Planning Obligations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the explanation to the Policy to clarify that viability will be considered at a development management stage for clarity.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF20</b></p>
469	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Policy ISA1	Object	There is no reference to the need to assess the viability of the development to afford the contributions requested and also the need to decide between competing requirements which can't all be afforded by the development. The difference between	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Once the infrastructure required to enable a scheme to proceed (such as access and servicing) has been addressed, the priorities given to the provision of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>required infrastructure such as services and other S106 contributions needs to be made.</p>	<p>different types of infrastructure and community benefits will vary depending upon a number of factors. Additionally, the priority given to different types of infrastructure will vary according to the scale, type and the specific policies applicable to the development. It is expected however that the requirement for planning obligations will aim to address the key issues of the Plan, with the provision of affordable housing being of paramount importance.</p> <p>Where the deliverability of a development may be compromised by the scale of planning obligations and other costs, a viability assessment may be necessary. This should be informed by the particular circumstances of the site and proposed development in question. Assessing the viability of a particular site requires more detailed analysis than at plan level. It is agreed that this should be clarified in the explanation to the Policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the explanation to the Policy to reflect the need to consider viability and the need to prioritise will vary from site to</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>site, subject to consideration of corporate priorities. Also amend the Policy to differentiate between essential/ enabling infrastructure and necessary infrastructure..</p> <p><b>Focused change NF20</b></p>
511	Gwynedd Archaeological planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	Policy ISA1	Object	<p>Interpretation, conservation and enhancement of historic features, monuments, buildings or landscape elements should be considered in this list</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Specific infrastructure requirements will vary in different locations and be dependent upon the scale and nature of proposed development. Infrastructure may be required to facilitate development or can be required to make a development acceptable. It may include elements from the list contained as part of the Policy. The list is not intended to be exhaustive or limiting, but it gives an indication of the potential scope of infrastructure which may be required.</p> <p>Nonetheless, including the features suggested by the objector in the policy would ensure accuracy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add additional bullet point to policy.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<b>Focussed Change NF19</b>
697	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	Policy ISA1	Object	<p>This policy seeks to ensure that financial contributions or infrastructure are provided by development proposals where necessary in order to make them acceptable and to allow the development to proceed.</p> <p>However, contributions are sought to a broad range of potential purposes which are not clearly defined, are not related to planning, or are not in the control of an applicant or indeed a council to deliver.</p> <p>The policy fails the CIL regulations and should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The policy therefore does not comply with Test of Soundness C2 as it does not comply with Planning Policy Wales and CE2.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is agreed that 'Regeneration' and 'Other contributions considered appropriate' are non-specific examples and should be omitted from the policy to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Delete 'regeneration' and 'other contribution considered appropriate to the proposal'. Include 'public realm and amend the explanation to explain that the list is not exhaustive or limiting.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF19</b></p>
948	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	Policy ISA1	Object	<p>It is necessary to ensure that Bangor's infrastructure can cope with the additional dwellings. The roads, schools, GPs surgeries, water systems, sewage systems, police services, the hospital, let alone the general amenities are already unsuitable for the population in Bangor without adding more to them. Nothing should be built unless</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The capacity of existing infrastructure to cope with any new development will be considered by the Local Planning Authority as part of the planning application process subject to Policy ISA and the CIL Regs.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				residents have easy access to adequate infrastructure including schools, surgeries, shops and community amenities.	<p>Should there be a requirement for additional infrastructure this policy allows the councils to seek such infrastructure as part of the development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1060	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	Policy ISA1	Object	Clarification is required about what infrastructure is required to deliver the allocated sites and how and when this will be delivered within the plan period, and whether any phasing of development will be required. It is not clear whether Policy ISA1 prioritises the infrastructure requirement or whether this is merely a list. The viability work relating to the site deliverability is also weak. The authority should also be able to indicate a priority list, in the generality, of what obligations it will seek from development and the financial magnitude of such obligations and the impact of viability. If a CIL is not in place, there could be a policy vacuum in the plan's ability to capture financial receipts to support development.	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>Topic Paper 13 Community Infrastructure sets out the existing and known planned infrastructure in the Plan area. Preparation of this Topic Paper is an iterative one and will be revised as new information is received. The process of assessing Candidate Sites has also provided useful information at a site specific level. Therefore, all of the infrastructure needed to deliver the Plan's Strategy has been assessed. At this stage, it is anticipated that funding will be secured through other mechanisms outside the remit of CIL and therefore the pooling of 5 or more contributions to aid</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>delivery of infrastructure is not anticipated to be an issue. Whilst this is the approach that will be taken at this stage, the Councils will continue to monitor the situation. The Topic Paper about community infrastructure and the work undertaken to justify the allocations in the Plan will form an useful starting point to consider whether there is a requirement for a CIL charging schedule. Any such considerations would be assessed by a study to investigate the viability potential of adopting a CIL charging schedule. Where developments generate a need for improvements to existing or require new infrastructure, such as highway improvements, promotion of active travel, contributions to employment opportunities, education provision, the Welsh language, environmental enhancements or improvements to public realm and open space, these will be required as part of the development and explained in further detail within the proposed Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p> <p>The list included in the Policy is not intended to be exhaustive or limiting, but</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>it gives an indication of the potential scope of infrastructure which may be required. It is not deemed appropriate to identify a rigid or consistent prioritisation of infrastructure requirements that can be used to pre-determine the type of developer contribution to be provided. Nonetheless it is considered that a reader's understanding of the Plan would be improved if the information about known infrastructure requirements is set out. On this basis a settlement profile topic paper will include concise development briefs which will outline the infrastructure requirements for each allocated site and will indicate whether any phasing of development will be required. The SPG on Planning Obligations will provide more detailed information regarding what obligations the Local Authority will seek from development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the explanation to the Policy to state that the list is not exhaustive or limiting and to include a reference to the new topic paper.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<b>Focussed change NF20</b>
1173	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Policy ISA1	Support	In order to ensure that sufficient infrastructure exists for domestic development capital investment is sought in the 5 year Asset Management Plans (AMP) to address deficiencies. An adopted Local Plan with identified growth helps strengthen the company can put forward in relation to AMP funding projects. Due to the regulatory framework there is potential disparity in the timeframes of our AMP and the LDP. There may be instances where 'lead-in' times are required to bring an infrastructure project and associated funding to fruition. Where specific infrastructure improvements are required in advance of AMP investment we support the provision within the policy of seeking financial contributions from developers to secure necessary improvements.	<b>Note comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
109	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	7.1.10	Support	Not enough attention has been given to Bangor's infrastructure when building. You cannot construct one more house in Bangor without considering infrastructure - roads, sewerage, water supply, surgeries, schools, shops, parks, the police, hospitals, community centres and play areas etc.	<b>Not accepted</b>  The capacity of existing infrastructure to cope with any new development will be considered by the Local Planning Authority as part of the planning application process.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1125 1126 1127	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	7.1.10 – 7.1.12	Object	<p>The clarity of these paragraphs should be improved. There is little consistency in the terminology used such that the Plan isn't clear as to expectations in terms of what the Councils are proposing when referring to "community benefits".</p> <p>There appears to be overlap in the use of this term to cover a number of concepts :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· * Section 106 obligations (as referred to in PS2).</li> <li>· * "community infrastructure contributions" (7.1.10) and "infrastructure provision" (7.1.11)</li> <li>· * Planning obligations (7.1.10 and 7.1.11)</li> <li>· * CIL levy receipts (7.1.10)</li> <li>· * Voluntary "community benefits" offered by developers.</li> </ul> <p>Terms and definitions are proposed.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is agreed that the terminology used in the policy should be more consistent.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the policy as suggested to ensure clarity and consistency.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF20</b></p>
121	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	7.1.10	Object	<p>Confusion is caused by the use of a number of terms which appear to relate to the same thing these being 'infrastructure',</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>It is agreed that there should be more</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>'community benefit' and 'community infrastructure contributions'. Use one word to describe S106 contributions to avoid confusion.</p> <p>There is no reference to the need to assess the viability of the scheme to provide the 'community benefits'. Additional wording required or new para to talk about viability assessments in relation to the amount and range of community benefits requested.</p>	<p>consistency in the terminology used. See response to representation 1125-1127 above.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding the need to assess the viability of a scheme, see response to 439</p> <p>The SPG on Planning Obligations will provide more detailed information regarding what obligations the Local Authority will seek from development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the wording to improve clarity and consistency with Regulations.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF20</b></p>
1087	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	7.1.13	Object	<p>Paragraph 7.1.13 of the Deposit Plan notes that engagement with Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water has been undertaken through Plan preparation process. NRW is aware that there may be capacity issues with Treborth Waste Water Treatment Works that serves Bangor, Y Felinheli, Bethel, and an area of south Anglesey. This may constrain development within these areas, and therefore we strongly recommend that Dwr Cymru / Welsh Water's views are sought on</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Dŵr Cymru has been consulted during the identification of potential sites for development. As part of the planning application process, the Local Planning Authority will consult with Dŵr Cymru about the capacity of existing infrastructure to cope with development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				this specific issue.	No change is required to address the objector's representation.  <b>No change</b>

#### ISA2 – Community Facilities

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
267	The Theatres Trust (Ross Anthony) [2825]	POLICY ISA2	Support	The Theatres Trust supports this policy. It now provides a clear statement for the protection and enhancement of your existing essential community and cultural facilities, and along with Policy ISA1, encouragement to provide new and additional facilities.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1128	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY ISA2	Object	Generally supportive of Policy ISA2, it needs to be recognised that any facilities which could be classed as community facilities which may come forward within worker accommodation campuses as part of its Worker Accommodation Strategy should not be subject to these policies. Rather than seek for specific amendments to policy ISA2 however, Horizon is to relying on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which will be the relevant policies against which to determine its associated development applications. For this reason	<b>Not accepted</b>  Any proposals that are associated with the proposed Wylfa Newydd project, will be assessed against Policy PS9 and a number of other policies the Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the objector's representation.  <b>No change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion of its associated development (i.e. temporary worker accommodation) from these policies.	
1394	Cyng/Counc RH Wyn Williams [367]	POLICY ISA2	Object	<p>I would like you to consider the following regarding Abersoch, because the plan is for a period of 10 years or more:-</p> <p>The bounded area should be identified as a location for services without any growth</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The Policy recognises that in some instances the footprint of a proposed community facility can't be accommodated within the defined development boundary. It provides a degree of flexibility therefore to reasonably facilitate essential new community development. The explanation to the Policy explains that proposals outside a settlement must demonstrate that the proposed location is the best available and is accessible to the local community.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1417	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	POLICY ISA2	Object	The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Policy ISA2 aims to protect existing</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development: * Provision of community facilities that satisfy local need.	community facilities and encourages the development of new facilities where appropriate.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the objector's representation.  <b>No change</b>

#### ISA3 – Further and Higher Education Development

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
1129	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY ISA3	Object	Horizon notes that these site selection limitations are potentially too restrictive if applied to its associated development. Rather than seek for specific amendments to policy ISA3 Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which would be the relevant policies against which to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion of its associated development (i.e. simulator building) from these policies.	<b>Not accepted</b>  Any proposals for nuclear related development including that associated with the proposed Wylfa Newydd, will be assessed against Policy PS9 and numerous policies in the Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the objector's representation.  <b>No change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations

#### ISA4 – Safeguarding Existing Open Space

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
110	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	7.1.20	Support	Existing open plots should not be built on or destroyed at all	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1071	Mr Mark Newey, Welsh government	7.1.21	Object	'surplus provision' or 'over provision' - It is not clear how the Councils will demonstrate surplus/ over provision of open space, as described at clause 1 and in Para 7.1.21.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Guidance can be found in section 2 of TAN16 on undertaking an Open Space Assessment in order to identify areas of over and under provision of public open space. An SPG will also be prepared to provide further guidance to developers on undertaking open space assessments in relation to any future housing developments.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					No Change

#### ISA5 – Provision of Open Spaces in New Housing Developments

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
122	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Policy ISA5	Object	<p>Point 1 is unacceptable as a developer cannot be expected to provide open space off site on land he doesn't own. If provision cannot be provided on site then an off site contribution should be taken to improve existing facilities in the area as at point 2. There is no reference to the adoption/management of such spaces.</p> <p>Point 1 should be removed or reworded. Reference needs to be made in the explanatory text with regard to adoption and management of such spaces.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Point 1 notes that providing off site provision may not be feasible in some circumstances and where this is the case, developers should contribute towards new or improved facilities.</p> <p>An SPG on the provision of open spaces in new housing developments will provide details regarding the adoption/management of such spaces.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
304	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	Policy ISA5	Object	Greater emphasis should be given to the provision of unstructured open space in this policy and paragraph 7.1.23 and others. At a time when young people are better-informed about environmental issues but also increasingly cut off from direct contact with nature, we think that opportunities to discover the outdoors first-hand must be provided. Through links with other policies and strategies the LDP can allow young people to engage more in their own surroundings and with examples of conservation and sustainability in action.	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Policy ISA5 refers specifically to the requirement for housing developments of a certain size to address the need for opportunities for healthy recreation and leisure activities for occupants of new development. It is accepted that the Policy isn't sufficiently clear in terms of facilitating improved accessibility to existing open spaces, formal or informal greenspaces.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend criterion 2 to refer to contribution towards the improvement of accessibility to existing open space facilities or existing natural greenspaces. This aligns with Policy PS5, which includes the need to improve the understanding and appreciation of the natural environment in terms of its social contribution.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF22</b></p>
1130	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	Policy ISA5	Object	Horizon notes that these criteria in this policy are not appropriate for its temporary construction worker accommodation. For	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Any proposals for development</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>example it would be an inappropriate standard for typical occupiers e.g. construction workers, students in temporary single person accommodation, to require children's play space.</p> <p>Rather than seek for specific amendments to ISA5 to exclude application of this policy from the worker accommodation, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which would be the relevant policies against which to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon isn't proposing specific exclusion of its associated development from this policy.</p>	<p>associated with the proposed Wylfa Newydd, will be assessed against Policy PS9 and a number of other policies in the Plan including Policy TA13.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

## Information and Communications Technology

### PS3 – Information and Communications Technology

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
533	Mobile Operators Association (Mr John Cooke) [1638]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS3	Support	We support the inclusion of Strategic Policy PS3 which we consider to be in accordance with national policy and guidance.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
1415	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS3	Support	<p>The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Allowing technology development to facilitate employment development in rural areas;</li> <li>* Support working from home and measures that would improve broadband and communication particularly in the remote areas.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Note supporting comment.</b></p> <p>Policy PS3 facilitates accessibility to rural areas through information technology.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

### Sustainable Transport, Development and Accessibility

#### PS4 – Sustainable Transport, Development and Accessibility

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
664	Noel Davey, Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	<p>We support the transport hierarchy in PS4 and para 7.1.28 which gives priority to access by walking and cycling, so as to minimise the need to travel by private car. PS4 #3 aims to "Improve and enhance the public footpath and cycleway network to improve safety, accessibility by these modes of travel". We would add "and to increase health, leisure, well-being and tourism benefits</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>It is felt that the additional wording would add value to the policy through highlighting the benefits from walking and cycling.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Include the proposed amendment in the revised version of Strategic Policy PS4.</p>



Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				for both local residents and visitors". The strategy appears to have mainly access for new development projects in mind, but should also address wider RoW network issues.	<b>Focused Change NF23</b> <b>Minor Change NB3</b>
1131	Horizon	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	Horizon welcomes the policy requirement that development will be located so as to minimise the need to travel. This supports Horizon's stage one pre-application consultation which has based site selection for accommodation on (among other factors) its proximity to the Wylfa site. Provision of on-site facilities and services further supports this approach, with connection to other existing settlements forming a secondary consideration. Horizon's amendment seeks to remove linking rail upgrades with its project to the policy specifically on rail infrastructure. Horizon has clarified that infrastructure improvements required must be required in accordance with the CIL Regulations.	<b>Accepted in part</b> – Agree with the representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly. However amending the policy with a reference to specific tests within the CIL Regulations would add unnecessary detail to the policy. This matter is addressed within the introduction to policy PS2 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.  <b>Recommendation</b> – Amend wording in relation to rail-related improvements and reference to Section 106 obligations.  <b>Focused Change NF23</b>
148	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	With a preferred area of search for sand and gravel identified at Bodychain, Llanllyfni under Policy MWYN3, should this area prove commercially viable and planning permission be granted the existing plant site could be utilised at Cefn Graianog with a connection under the	<b>Accepted</b> – Agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.  It is felt that the additional wording adds flexibility to Strategic Policy PS4.  <b>Recommendation</b> – Include the additional

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>existing footpath/cycle path being required. As such some might consider this would not enhance the footpath/cycle path.</p> <p>At point 3 start with quote: "Where possible improve and enhance..."</p>	<p>wording at the start of Point 3 in Strategic Policy PS4.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF23</b></p>
448	Bourne Leisure Ltd	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	<p>Bourne Leisure considers that the following sentence should be added to PS4:</p> <p>"in rural areas, the Council acknowledges that there is little alternative but to travel by private car."</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.</p> <p>Planning Policy Wales (PPW) promotes sustainable development. Paragraph 4.7.7 in PPW states that the majority of new development should be located in those settlements which have relatively good accessibility by non-car modes. The Plan's spatial strategy is based upon the principle of paragraph 4.7.7 in PPW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
527	Bangor Civic Society	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Support	PS4 – Sustainable Transport	<p><b>Note Supporting Comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
617	Mr Mark Roberts, Barton Willmore, Cardiff	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	Support the overall aims and objectives of this policy, however the statement "development will be located so as to minimise the need to travel" does not reflect PPW. PPW only refers to "minimising the need to travel, and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car (paragraph 4.7.4) and not minimising the need to travel in isolation. The policy is therefore overly rigid, not positively prepared and does not recognise the ability of bus, cycle and pedestrian links to offer sustainable, convenient access to various services.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any change.</p> <p>It is felt that the policy reflects the aspirations of Planning Policy Wales in terms of minimising the need to travel whilst seeking transport improvements that increase accessibility for all modes of transport.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1280	Bourne Leisure	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	Emerging transport policies should recognise that due to the location of many tourist facilities and attractions, there is often no other feasible option available other than the private car to reach certain tourist development. Bourne Leisure is disappointed that PS4 fails to recognise that some tourism sites are located in rural areas where no public transport exists. PS4 as currently drafted is unsound as it is not in accordance with national policy. TAN18: Transport (March 2007) specifically acknowledges that some tourist developments rely on car-based travel and advises: "...in rural areas	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any change.</p> <p>This statement could be interpreted as promoting the use of private cars. This is contrary to the aspirations of Planning Policy Wales in terms of transport use. In line with paragraph 3.11 of TAN 18 which refers to embodying sustainability principles, the Plan seeks to ensure that most development should be located in places accessible by a range of travel modes.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				a lack of public transport access needs to be balanced against the contribution tourism makes to the rural economy in the specific area..." (para 3.15) Bourne Leisure considers that the following sentence should be added to PS4: "in rural areas, the Council acknowledges that there is little alternative but to travel by private car."	<p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### TRA1 – Transport Network Developments

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1091	Natural Resources Wales	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	The Plan outlines 4 transport schemes that will be secured during the Plan period including the A487 Caernarfon to Bontnewydd bypass, the Llangefni Link Road, a new Menai Strait Crossing and road improvements on the A5025 from Valley to Wylfa Newydd. NRW would appreciate being involved in the discussions regarding these proposed schemes as early as possible in order to identify key development constraints and provide advice. For some of the above named schemes NRW has already provided Scoping advice.	<p><b>Do not Accept</b> – As part of the Planning Process statutory consultees such as NRW will be consulted. Including reference within the policy would add unnecessary detail to the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1132	Horizon	Policy TRA1	Object	There is a typographical error in 2. (ii) and	<b>Accepted in Part</b> – The spelling errors will be

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	Nuclear Power	Transport Network Developments		<p>(iii) where in each case "facilitates" should be amended to read "facilities". (Not shown in the specific amendments sought.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend 3(i) for clarity including bring the table into the policy so it is clear what development is affected.</li> <li>• New 3(ii) then arises from the second limb of the existing text (after the table).</li> <li>• Amend 4(iii) to ensure there is no suggestion that the Plan is pre-empting the environmental impact assessments which Horizon is undertaking and from which the need for transport infrastructure upgrades should derive from.</li> </ul>	<p>corrected.</p> <p>Agree that section 3 of the policy would benefit from minor re-drafting to improve clarity. However it is felt to be more appropriate to retain the table in paragraph 7.1.31.</p> <p>The list in part 4 of policy TRA 1 is identified transport schemes that the Plan seeks to protect through showing them on the proposals map. In light of the comment regarding ongoing environmental impact assessment regarding the need for transport infrastructure upgrades which Horizon is currently undertaking reference to these improvements, together with the areas shown on the proposals map, should be removed from policy TRA 1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Amend section 3 and 4 (iii) to improve clarity.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF24</b></p>
1133 & 1134	Horizon Nuclear Power	Paragraphs 7.1.30 to 7.1.44	Object	<p>Related to the representations on TRA1, new wording to replace existing paragraph 7.1.41 has been provided to avoid pre-emption and to refer to the development of Horizon's Integrated Traffic and Transport Strategy ("ITTS"). Horizon supports the inclusion of a suitably worded statement in support of</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Agree to the re-wording of the title above paragraph 7.1.41 and paragraph 7.1.44 to highlight where the need for transport infrastructure upgrades has been demonstrated.</p> <p>Travel Plans are already referenced in paragraphs 7.1.30 and 7.1.32, however</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				it working in partnership with the Councils to develop an agreed ITTS for the Project, to be supported through policy TRA1.	<p>previous response has agreed to include reference within policy TRA 1 to travel plans.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Amend title to paragraph 7.1.41 and paragraph 7.1.44.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF25</b> <b>Minor Change NB2</b></p>
1185, 1186, 1187	Welsh Water	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	There are a number of locations where the proposed route passes over DCWW assets (public sewers and water mains). Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	<p><b>Do not Accept</b> – As part of the Planning Process statutory consultees such as Dwr Cymru Welsh Water will be consulted. Including reference within the policy would add unnecessary detail to the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
525	Bangor Civic Society	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	TRA1: Transport Networks 4) 'Transport Schemes' - there is a complete absence of any rail proposals.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any change.</p> <p>Safeguarding existing rail lines is included in TRA3.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
876	Mr John Tripp, Porthaethwy	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	* too much emphasis on cars; *cycleways to be implemented (not positive enough); * rail and bus. Electric rail - as part of extension of the HS3 Holyhead to Hull.	<b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.  It is felt that Policy TRA1 conforms to the aspirations of Planning Policy Wales in terms of transport use.  <b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1055	Mr Mark Newey, Llywdoraeth Cymru	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	The potential loss of BMV land could result in the permanent loss of approximately 40 hectares. The majority of the land is included in allocations TRA1, C14 and C15 and the plan has limited evidence to demonstrate that paragraph 4.10 has been considered at all in allocating these sites for development.	<b>Not Accepted</b> – The land identified in policy TRA 1 are highway improvement schemes that have been identified as routes requiring protection within the plan.  It is acknowledged that the Llangefni link road does cross over high quality agricultural land in the vicinity of Llangefni however this proposal has the benefit of a planning permission under 34LPA1013/FR/EIA/CC. Therefore the loss of high quality agricultural land has been assessed as part of the application.  All relevant bodies would be consulted on all

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the developments highlighted in Policy TRA1, and the permanent loss of high quality agricultural land would be addressed at the application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No change to Policy TRA1.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
683	Barton Willmore	7.1.31	Object	Paragraph 7.1.31 and 7.1.32 provides extensive commentary on the need and requirements for Transport Assessments, but duplicates PPW. This is unnecessary.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.</p> <p>Paragraphs 7.1.31 and 7.1.32 provide context to Policy TRA1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
530	Bangor Civic Society	7.1.37	Object	Tern E22 – Clarification is needed of whether Britannia Bridge and parts of North Wales are still on E22.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any change.</p> <p>It is felt that paragraph 7.1.37 does explain that the A55 is on the E22.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p>



Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
877	Mr John Tripp	7.1.37	Object	Menai Straits Crossing – why not submerge tunnel from Griffiths Crossing. Has thought been given to: *reversible 2 lane crossing on A55 *the rail deck beneath the A55 is only 50% used.	<b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.  Options on a third crossing of the Menai Strait are being considered by the Welsh Government but to date no formal decision has been made.  <b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
512	Gwynedd Archaeological Trust Planning Service	7.1.42  (Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments)	Support	Formal consultation on these improvements will be required since some of these areas have the potential to impact upon the archaeological resource.	<b>Do not Accept</b> – As part of the Planning process consultees such as the Gwynedd Archaeological Trust will be consulted. Including reference within the policy would add unnecessary detail to the policy.  <b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

### TRA2 – Parking Standards

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1096	Mr Mark Newey, Llywdoraeth Cymru	Policy TRA2 Parking Standards  (paragraph 7.1.45)	Object	It should be noted that Planning Policy Wales sets out that local authorities should ensure that new developments provide lower levels of parking than have generally been achieved in the past. Technical Advice Note 18 states that maximum car parking standards should be used as a form of demand management.	<p><b>Accepted</b> – We agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>Reference will be given to Planning Policy Wales and TAN 18 in explanation paragraphs 7.1.45 and 7.1.46.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Make changes to paragraph 7.1.45 based upon the submitted comments.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF26</b></p>

### TRA3 – Safeguarding Disused Railway Lines

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
161	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited	Policy TRA3 Disused Railway Lines	Object	As with Policy PS4 with a preferred area of search for sand and gravel identified at Bodychain, Llanllyfni under Policy MWYN3, should this area prove commercially viable and planning permission be granted the existing plant site could be utilised at Cefn Graianog with a connection under the existing footpath/cyclepath being required.  Suggest re-wording of policy & quote:	<p><b>Accepted</b> – We agree with the representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>It is felt that additional wording should be added to the policy, rather than replacing the original wording, as it adds value to the sustainability objective of the policy. However, the original wording should be retained, as it is important that development that potentially prevents the re-opening of disused or</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				"Where appropriate and viable the possible re-opening of disused railway infrastructure for railway use or for alternative transport purposes will be promoted and encouraged."	redundant railway infrastructure is discouraged.  <b>Recommendation</b> – Make changes to Policy TRA3 based upon the submitted comments.  <b>Focussed Change NF27</b>
440	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog	Policy TRA3 Disused Railway Lines	Support	We hope that Gwynedd Council can help to solve this matter.	<b>Note supporting Comments</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### TRA4 – Managing Transport Impacts

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
150	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited	Policy TRA4 Managing Transport Impacts	Object	The policy is considered too rigid and allows no scope for potential mitigation works through planning obligations and conditions. Each case should be dealt with on its merits and demonstrate through accompanying information with a planning application that it can work with or without mitigation.  Revise wording to allow flexibility for negotiations.	<b>Accepted</b> – Agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.  The suggested amendment will add flexibility to the policy.  <b>Recommendation</b> – An additional sentence to be added to the policy, in order to allow for further flexibility in determining applications.  <b>Minor Change NB3</b>
151	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited				
598	Barton Willmore (Mr	Policy TRA4 Managing	Object	We are concerned that the test "proposals that would cause	<b>Accepted in part</b> – Agreed that the Glossary of Terms should be amended to explain what type

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	Mark Roberts, Cardiff)	Transport Impacts		<p>unacceptable harm to the safe and efficient operation of the highway...will be refused" is imprecise and not positively prepared. There is nothing in the policy as to what constitutes "unacceptable". Development will have an impact on highway networks through increased traffic. Also, the policy does not allow or consider the ability of development proposals to mitigate or reduce impacts on the network.</p> <p>Change: We consider that the policy should state that developments which would have a "severe/significant unacceptable residual impact..." should be the required test.</p>	<p>of development would be deemed to be unacceptable in relation to various policies within the Plan.</p> <p>Do not agree with the suggested amendments in relation to "severe/significant unacceptable residual impact..." since this could allow proposals that would impact upon the safe and efficient operation of the highway, public transport and other movement networks.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Add reference to unacceptable in the Glossary of Terms.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF111</b></p>
529	Bangor Civic Society	TRA4 Managing Transport Impacts	Object	<p>TRA4: Transport impacts. delete 'where necessary'. Safe provision should always be provided for groups listed.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – The wording in the policy was to reflect that provision for all modes of transport will be applicable with every type of development. However agree that the term 'where possible' is somewhat misleading.</p> <p>In light of this an amendment to 'Where appropriate' is suggested and this would also mean the policy is in line with the explanation in paragraph 7.1.51 which refers to measures appropriate to a particular proposal.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Make changes to Policy TRA4 to read 'where appropriate'.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<b>Minor Change NB3</b>
1835	Mr Noel Davey, Council for the Protection of Rural Wales	TRA4 Managing Transport Impacts	Object	This policy is quite weak and gives cursory treatment of planning commitments for public rights of way. Wording in the JLDP along the lines of that in the Gwynedd UDP policy CH22 'Cycling Networks, Paths and Rights of Way' is required, giving a much more detailed and explicit commitment to safeguarding and promote the RoW network. The JLDP should recognise its importance for visitor economy, recreational benefits, national health and well-being with a strong emphasis on safeguarding and promoting the All Wales Coastal path.	<b>Not Accepted</b> – The purpose of policy TRA 4 is to ensure that new development provides safe and convenient provision for different modes of transport where that is appropriate.  Policy PS4 refers to the need to improve and enhance the public footpath and cycleway network and is felt to provide sufficient support for public rights of way in the Plan.

## CHAPTER 7.2 SUSTAINABLE LIVING

### Sustainable Development and Climate Change

#### Context and Introduction

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
770	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	7.2.4	Object	<p>We appreciate that emerging national policy sees 'sustainable development' as the main purpose of the land use planning system and requires the LDP to place these principles at the heart of its local strategy. However, we question whether the proposed sustainable development policies can be applied effectively at the more local scale in the planning system. We have a major concern that so much weight is to be placed on three generalised policies related to sustainable development (PCYFF1-3). We think that the testing of all proposals against these overarching principles could readily become a bland ritual without much meaning in every Design and Access Statement, while at the same time planning decisions could become more arbitrary and less objective when tested against these generalised statements. The emphasis gained from explicit criteria attached to individual policies for each type of proposal will be lost. In many cases there will be no explicit policy, but only a requirement to refer to the broad</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The Plan will be considered in its entirety when assessing development proposals and policies PCYFF 1-3 should not be read in isolation. Equal weight will be placed on all the detailed policies in the Plan. The inclusion of all three policies subjects all planning applications to national planning policy and avoids unnecessary repetition throughout the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				sustainable development polices.	
1056	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.2.4	Object	<p>A Renewable Energy Assessment has been undertaken for both areas, however the Deposit Plan fails to take the opportunity to take into account the contribution the area can make towards developing and facilitating renewable and low carbon energy and plan positively for appropriate development. Further consideration needs to be given to how to translate the evidence base into a set of policies which guide appropriate development. For example, could the assessment work provide evidence to provide opportunities for higher sustainable building standards on strategic sites or can the co-location of developments optimise opportunities for renewable energy?</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>The updated toolkit for Planners in relation to Planning for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (Sept 2015) has an additional section to assess the potential for solar farm developments. In addition a letter dated the 10 December 2015 by the Minister for Natural Resources expects the allocation of areas of search for local-authority scale (5MW to 25MW) renewable energy schemes or other low carbon technologies.</p> <p>In light of this the Councils have commissioned additional work to ascertain any potential areas for solar farm developments. In addition an assessment against the areas Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity study will ascertain whether any local-authority scale areas of search should be identified in the Plan.</p> <p>The introduction to policy PS7 has been amended to reflect this on-going work.</p> <p>The Deposit plan did not identify strategic</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>sites.</p> <p>Agree that an additional criterion could be included within policy PS5 in relation to promoting co-location of development to optimise opportunities for renewable energy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Include an additional criterion within policy PS5 in relation to co-location of development.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF28</b></p>

**PS5 – Sustainable Development**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
111	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Support	Construction should occur on brownfield sites and not on greenfield sites. It is recommended to look at how to reuse brownfield sites prior to new building on greenfield sites, including demolishing housing if they are not fit for purpose. Better use should be made of brownfield sites in order to safeguard greenfield sites and fields. For example, there is an area near the	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				Dewi Sant precinct roundabout which is deserted due to demolishing housing; Hendrewen; corner site opposite Ysbyty Gwynedd. e.g. flats could be built near the Dewi Sant precinct with a parking floor to avoid flood problems.	
167	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	This general policy lacks clarity as to where it applies e.g. not all landscapes and biodiversity assets are of the same value and it will not always be possible to 'protect and enhance' assets. If it is considered to apply to mineral extraction sites suggest changes as set out below.	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>The policy will be applicable with all forms of development. It is accepted that not all landscapes and biodiversity assets are of the same value and this will be given weight in the assessment of any application.</p> <p>Figure 4.4. of PPW defines previously developed land. It is not felt appropriate to make reference to specific types of uses within the policy. The reference to development boundaries provides a sequential approach to development and the criterion does refer to the most appropriate places outside the boundaries.</p> <p>To ensure that consideration is given towards employment developments a reference to PS10 and PS11 should be added to criterion 3.</p>
168	Larfage Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			Suggest a hierarchy for assessing environmental effects of development proposals (not all landscapes and biodiversity assets are of the same value) and notwithstanding other policies in the development plan. At point 3 include former quarry sites in definition of previously developed land and remove reference to development boundaries. At points 6 and 7 start "Where possible..."	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That reference to PS10 and PS11 is added to criterion 3.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF28</b></p>
397	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Support	DCWW support the inclusion of this policy and its emphasis upon reducing the amount of water used and wasted, and reducing the effect on water resources and quality, and maximising the use of sustainable drainage schemes. We fully support the promotion of sustainable development and look to your authority to ensure that appropriate designs include water efficiency, water conservation and sustainable drainage to comply with high standards of the Code for Sustainable Homes and BREEAM.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
766	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	All development proposals are required to fulfil nine objectives. We fully agree with the objectives in principle but do not see how all proposals, such as small extensions to houses, could demonstrate in practice how they would contribute to all of them, especially #6 'preserve and 'enhance' the quality of .. assets' and #7 protect and'	<p><b>Not accepted.</b></p> <p>It is accepted that not all proposals such as small extensions, could contribute to all the principles listed in the policy. Each development proposal will be considered separately and assessed on a case by case basis.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				improve' the quality of the natural environment. There is probably a need to add some qualifier e.g. 'wherever possible'. It is noted that the introduction of objectives #10-14 does include the words 'proposals should also where appropriate:'	<p>It is felt that adding a qualifier as suggested would devalue the requirement for proposals to adopt the principles of sustainable development in other types of development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
767	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	PS5 #4 'Promote greater self---containment of Centres and Villages by contributing to balanced communities that are supported by sufficient services; cultural, arts, sporting and entertainment activities; a varied range of employment opportunities; physical and social infrastructure; and a choice of modes of travel;' This approach will clash with pressure for 'economies of scale' e.g. the current arguments about concentration of services in N Wales NHS.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Promoting the self-containment of settlements is important to ensure communities are balanced and in turn, promote sustainable development in the Plan area, which is advocated in national planning policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
768	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	Criterion 13 Improve sense by inserting 'car' and deleting 'means of': 'Reduce the need to travel by car and encourage the opportunities for all users to travel when required as often as possible by means of alternative modes'.	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>The suggested amendment will add clarity to the policy. However, 'private transport' should be inserted instead of 'car'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Include reference to private transport in the policy.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF28</b></p>
852	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	This is a 14-part policy, requiring compliance with a plethora of issues. It does not embody a presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in PPW. It does not allow the balancing of the benefits of development to the social, economic and indeed environmental (remediation and redevelopment of previously developed and contaminated site for example) themes with any adverse impacts. It is a largely negatively worded policy. PPW provides a clear presumption in favour of sustainable development. It does not embody any aspect of this approach and should be rewritten to provide a positive policy and	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is agreed that the wording of the policy would benefit from minor editorial changes to demonstrate that the Plan will be positively seeking sustainable development. Detailed application of these principles is set out in other sections of the Plan. The criteria in the Policy signpost the reader to where in the Plan the policies may be found.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Re-word the first and second sentence of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>It should be re-worded in order to provide a positive policy and a presumption in support of sustainable development.</p>	<p>the policy to ensure it sets out the Plan's presumption in favour of sustainable development in accordance with national planning policy guidance.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF28</b></p>
853	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	<p>We note that there is no policy, which expresses in overall terms and from which all policies flow that provides a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This is fundamental of the approach of the Welsh Government and PPW. There is a sustainable development policy, Policy PS5; however this does not provide a "presumption in favour of sustainable development."</p> <p>This omission is a stark omission and significant oversight which goes to the heart of the policies and approach of the Plan.</p> <p>Policy which gives presumption in support of sustainable development.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>See response to representation 852.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>See recommendation in response to representation 852.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF28</b></p> <p>See response to representation 852 above.</p>
986	Welsh Slate Ltd [3147]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	<p>Whilst listing 13 objectives there is a total failure to include any reference to minerals, regardless of any reference/s to Strategic Policy PS18.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Policy PS18 specifically relates to the need to ensure the sustainable use of minerals. It is considered that this policy is sufficient in this respect.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1135	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	Horizon considers that it would be beneficial to remove some of the repetition, circularity and potential inconsistencies arising from references to other policies. For example, criteria 5, 6, 16, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 simply cross refer to other policies which will apply to and control these matters.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The strategic policies provide the context for the detailed policies in the Plan. Removing the criteria as suggested would devalue and weaken the policy in terms of ensuring that proposals adopt the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

**PS6 – Alleviating and Adapting to the Effects of Climate Change**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
126	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Object	<p>It is not clear how these requirements link to Building Regulations. If as appears they may be looking to achieve higher standards than Building Regulations then this is likely to affect the viability of a scheme. Has the financial impact of meeting these requirements been allowed for in the viability testing of housing/ affordable housing delivery?</p> <p>Provide clarification.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Paragraph 4.12.6 of PPW seeks to encourage applications that reflect key principles of climate responsive developments and that exceed the standards set out in building regulations.</p> <p>Viability will be a consideration with any application and the wording within the policy does state ‘fully taken account’ in relation to considering the alleviating and adapting to the effect of climate change.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
169 170	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686] Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Object	<p>Again general policy lacking definition of where it applies. If considered applies to mineral extraction sites suggest changes as set out below.</p> <p>Suggest a hierarchy for assessing effects of development proposals and notwithstanding other policies in the development plan.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The policy will be applicable to all forms of development. In accordance with national planning policy a core function of the Plan is to ensure that all development in the Plan area is sustainable, taking full account of the implications of reducing</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				At point 6 start "Where possible ..." At point 10 start "Where possible ..."	resource use and addressing climate change. This Policy is part of a framework for sustainable growth by promoting development that mitigates the causes of climate change and which is able to adapt to its likely effects.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the objector's representation.  <b>No change</b>
398	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Support	DCWW support the inclusion of this policy and the requirement placed upon developers to aim for the highest possible standard in terms of water efficiency and the use of sustainable drainage systems. The tackling of surface water at source is a vital component of sustainable development and will go a long way to mitigate against overloading sewers which can ultimately lead to flooding. The Floods and Water Management Act 2010 reinforces the obligations for developers to incorporate sustainable drainage systems as part of their developments.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
451	Bourne Leisure Ltd	STRATEGIC	Object	The Local Plan should recognise that specific	<b>Not accepted</b>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
845	[2768]  Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mr Arwel Evans) [2767]	POLICY PS6		uses, such as tourism uses, are often already sited on the coast or in river floodplains and that such uses require to be located adjacent to water in order to continue to attract visitors. The Local Plan should therefore allow for proposals for the improvement/expansion of existing tourism accommodation and facilities to be considered on a more flexible basis to new developments in such locations.	<p>In accordance to TAN15, the policy aims to direct new development away from areas at risk of flooding.</p> <p>It is recognised that much development has taken place alongside rivers and in the coastal plain. It is therefore inevitable, despite the overall aim to avoid flood risk areas, that some existing development will be vulnerable to flooding.</p> <p>Further development in such areas, whilst possibly benefitting from some protection, will not be free from risk and could in some cases exacerbate the consequences of a flood event for existing development and therefore a balanced judgement is required.</p> <p>The susceptibility of land to flooding will be a material consideration in deciding a planning application. For proposals located in zone C developers will need to demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the planning authority, that any development can be justified in that location and that the consequences associated with flooding are acceptable.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
661	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Support	We agree that tackling climate change and reducing carbon emissions is a key objective. We support the 'energy hierarchy' concept proposed in PS6 where ranked priority is given to 1) reducing need 2) efficient use and supply, before 3) using renewable energy. We also agree that renewable energy should be used wherever 'practical and viable' and should be 'consistent with the need to engage and involve local communities, protect visual amenities, the natural, built and historic environment and the landscape'.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
769	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Support	The proposed energy hierarchy is fully supported.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
846	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mr Arwel Evans) [2767]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Object	Bourne Leisure supports sustainable development in its buildings, venues and accommodation units. All new buildings,	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Paragraphs 4.11.5 and 9.1.2 of PPW</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				refurbishments of existing venues and the company's hire fleet holiday homes incorporate a number of features designed to achieve sustainable development. It is considered that sustainable design and construction should be primarily sought via Building Regulations. It is proposed that the Plan should make it clear that the initial design of a building will need to consider the ability to meet Building Regulations' requirements in the future. Based on the fact that TAN22 was cancelled it is unnecessary for the Plan to make reference to energy efficiency features and measures.	<p>promote energy efficiency with new development.</p> <p>The wording within PS6 is an expectation that developers have 'fully taken account' of factors that alleviate and adapt development to the effects of Climate change.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
859	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Support	Policy PS6 is supported	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1057	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Object	The renewable energy assessment could be used to improve the policy wording for PS6 and PCYFF4, as these stand they lack clarity. The energy assessment could make it clear what is expected and to what scale/ type of development the policies apply.	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>Including information regarding the renewable energy assessment in Policy PS6 would add unnecessary detail to the Strategic Policy. However, it is agreed that additional information should be</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>included in Policy PCYFF4. See response to representation no. 1058.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Additional information included in policy PCYFF4.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF32</b></p>

#### PCYFF1 – Development Criteria

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
123	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	<p>At point 4 the ability to build at a lower density needs to be not only based on local circumstances but also needs to take account of site constraints such as levels on sites or service easements.</p> <p>Add to the wording in brackets at point 4 after local add ' or site constraints'.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that site constraints should be considered should be considered when determining development density.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Include reference to site constraints in the policy to ensure clarity.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF29</b></p>
1136	Horizon Nuclear Power	POLICY	Object	Residual concerns that criterion 3 is more	<b>Accepted in part</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
	(Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	PCYFF1		restrictive in terms development siting than other sections of the Plan. It is also noted that Policy PS15 relates exclusively to housing whereas the wording of PCYFF1 implies that it relates to all forms of development, which risks creating confusion. · Criterion 4 is considered inconsistent with the drafting of the other criteria. · Criteria 9 and 10 requirements are dealt with elsewhere in the Plan and could be deleted here. · Criterion 14 is not sufficiently clear.	<p>It is agreed that a degree of discretion should be reflected in the policy. It is acknowledged that the suggested amendments would add clarity and accuracy to the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Apply a degree of discretion to bullet points 1 and 2; and amend bullet 14.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF29</b></p>
774	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	<p>This policy provides a 14 part multi criteria policy, and the first and second requirements are that "A proposal must comply with all relevant policies of the Plan", and "must comply with national planning policy and guidance." This is considered to be an impossible task, because the Policy does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* embody the presumption in favour of sustainable development and is not positively prepared.</li> <li>* allow for any application of the key requirement of planning, which is the balance of often competing and conflicting objectives, thus considering, what policies are of key relevance, what weight should be</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is agreed that a degree of discretion should be reflected in the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>See response to representation 1136 above.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF29</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>given to competing objectives and how does a proposal comply with the "presumption in favour of sustainable development of the Welsh Government", and</p> <p>* it replicates other policies in the Plan e.g. landscape, highways, design etc.</p> <p>The Policy needs to be rewritten in a positively prepared manner with a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	
124	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	<p>Should not use the word 'must' as this does not allow the flexibility for other material planning considerations to form part of the determination process. This ability to consider other material planning considerations is a fundamental part of national planning legislation.</p> <p>Change the word 'must' to 'should' on all the points where it is used.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is acknowledged that the plan should show a degree of flexibility and demonstrate some discretion in certain circumstances.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend policy wording as suggested to ensure accuracy. See response to representation 1136 above.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF29</b></p>
171	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	<p>General policy likely to be aimed at urban development but does not specify. There is no recognition of the particular circumstances of mineral working and the</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>Agree that there can be circumstances where specific locational requirement</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
172	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			<p>locational need for minerals to be worked where they are found. Suggest a hierarchy for assessing environmental effects of development proposals as not all environmental assets are of the same value. If applied too rigidly to mineral extraction sites then there is a risk of unnecessary sterilisation.</p> <p>The policy should 'endeavour' to achieve the aims of the policy. Exceptionally some developments such as minerals will not be able to comply with the aspirations of the policy but those schemes should nevertheless still be permissible. Suggest start the policy with "Where relevant all proposals should endeavour ..." then delete points 1, 2 and 8 as they are unwieldy and unnecessary.</p>	<p>could be justified for the location of a specific development.</p> <p>To allow for consideration of such circumstances criterion 3 within policy PCYFF1 should be amended through the inclusion of reference to specific locational requirement for a proposal.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend criterion 3 within policy PCYFF1.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF29</b></p>
307	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	<p>Greater emphasis should be given to the protection of the natural environment in this policy to reflect the importance of this issue throughout the LDP. Add point 15 "natural environment".</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The Policy's explanation states that the purpose of the policy is to raise issues that are not covered elsewhere in the Plan. The natural environment (like the built environment) is given attention in other parts of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<b>No change</b>
399	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY PCYFF1	Support	DCWW support the provision within this policy that planning permission will be refused where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the health, safety or amenity of occupiers of local residences, other land and property uses or characteristics of the locality due to drainage pollution.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
437	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	POLICY PCYFF1	Support	Support.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
772	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	Criterion 4 Housing density. While agreeing that dense settlement can be efficient in terms of land use etc. the impression on the landscape of dense estates of detached houses is alien to the traditional landscape in North Wales where settlement has not been significantly concentrated, except in 19th century quarrying areas. (See PCYFF2) If density is to be encouraged it should be through the building of terraces, rather than little boxes. The terrace or even semi-detached units produce much better	<b>Not accepted</b>  Other policies in the Plan will ensure that any development proposals that could potentially have a detrimental impact upon the landscape will be refused.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the objector's representation.



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				proportioned building blocks. The social (and economic) value of gardens should not be forgotten.	<b>No change</b>
881	Mr John Tripp [252]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	The uplands - a lot are overgrazed. Would like to see more 'regreening' to stop the immediate run off and flooding. Also, CO2 collect with trees.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Amending as suggested would add unnecessary detail to the policy. However it is agreed that regard should be made to the natural environment. See response to representation 307.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1015	Ministry of Defence (MOD Safeguarding) [1275]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	The MODs principle concern with respect to development in Anglesey and Gwynedd is ensuring that structures, particularly tall buildings do not cause an obstruction to air traffic movements at MOD aerodromes or compromise the operation of air navigational transmitter/ receiver facilities located in the area. The MOD height and technical safeguarding zones for the main operational base of RAF Valley and Mona extends over the area of Anglesey. The	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>As part of the planning application process, Anglesey County Council will consult the MOD when a particular proposal could potentially affect activities for which it is responsible. Including reference to the need to consult the MOD within the policy would add unnecessary detail to the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				borough is also covered by the statutory birdstrike safeguarding zone encompassing RAF Valley and Mona. Therefore if/when development is progressed the MOD DIO should be consulted to ensure an accurate and effective assessment is carried out. Gwynedd does not fall within any statutory safeguarding consultation zones.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### PCYFF2 – Design and Place Shaping

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
173	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	General policy likely to be aimed at urban development but does not specify e.g. (not all landscape is of the same value). If considered to apply to mineral extraction sites suggest changes set out below.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Developments associated with mineral extraction would be considered under other policies set out in the plan namely, Policies PS19, MWYN1-10. The policy does state that all the criteria need to be conformed to, but only where this is relevant.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p>
174	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			Each proposal should be dealt with on its merits however this policy if applied to mineral extraction sites it would prove very difficult to comply with. Suggest start the policy with "Where relevant ..." then amend points two to start "Where possible".	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
400	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY PCYFF2	Support	DCWW support the requirement that drainage systems are designed to limit surface water run-off and flood risk and prevent pollution.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
436	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	POLICY PCYFF2	Support	Support.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
775	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	Criterion 1 How practical is it to prove it 'enhances' as well as complements? When will it be judged 'relevant'?	<b>Not accepted</b>  It is considered that proposals can complement as well as enhance the character of a site.  Whilst design and place shaping go beyond traditional aesthetic considerations and should be the aim for all development proposals, the Policy recognises that not all the criteria will be relevant to all types of development, e.g. achieving active frontages at ground level will be more relevant to development located in town centres.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
776	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	5, 9, 11, 12 Use of design jargon - 'Secured by design... inclusive design... be legible...active frontage' - meanings may not be intelligible to the lay reader; re-word, provide explanatory text or glossary.	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>Review the text and provide clarification where required, e.g. Secured by Design should be defined and should be included in the glossary to ensure clarity.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend glossary of terms to include additional text.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF111</b></p>
778	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	Criterion 7ii must surely mean NOT precluding the reasonable use of neighbouring land.	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is agreed, that precluding the reasonable development of other adjacent land because of the layout and form of the development is not in accordance with the principles of sustainable development.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Re-word the bullet point</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF30</b></p>
943	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cyngorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	I believe there should be specific reference to standard design that corresponds to the context of the AONB.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The special landscape features of AONBs in the Plan Area are protected via Strategic Policy PS16 and national policies and legislation as outlined in table 23. Nonetheless it is considered that Policy CYFF3 would benefit from reference to reference to “or other detailed assessments adopted by the Local Planning Authority” to reflect the publication of an assessment of features that may be specific to the AONBs, which would be a material planning consideration.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to Policy PCYFF2. Amend Policy PCYFF 3 as referred to above.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<b>Focussed change NF31</b>
1425	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	<p>The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* New agricultural buildings that are suitable for contemporary farming having considered their scale, location, design and materials to reduce their visual impact on the landscape;</li> <li>* Where possible new buildings should be grouped with any existing buildings in order to reduce their visual impact on the landscape. However, isolated buildings should be permitted if their location is essential to the agricultural activity if they aren't located in a prominent location.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the issues raised by the objector are covered in other policies within the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
779	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	7.2.9	Support	We agree that proximity of poor development should not justify poor quality new development.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
780	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	7.2.10	Object	This implies some proposals will not require a Design and Access Statement - clarify which ones and what is required instead.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Including information regarding in what circumstances a Design and Access is required would add unnecessary detail to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>the Policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

#### PCYFF3 – Design and Landscaping

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
175	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY PCYFF3	Object	General policy likely to be aimed at urban development but does not specify e.g. (not all landscapes are of the same value). If considered to apply to mineral extraction sites suggest changes set out below.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The impacts of a particular scheme will be considered with any landscaping to mitigate any impact being part of the decision making process.</p> <p>In relation to mineral extraction sites where landscaping is not possible a site restoration programme will be given weight in relation to any short term visual impact from the development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>
176	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			Mineral extraction sites should be excluded from this policy suggest change of wording to start policy; "Where possible and in accordance with other policies set out in this plan ..."	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
781	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF3	Object	We agree with the aims, but have concern about the ability to monitor and enforce landscaping plans and conditions in practice.	<p><b>Note comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
773	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF3	Object	Criterion 1 - We have been unable to locate online detailed Seascape Character Area Assessments	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The information relating to Seascape Character Area Assessments are available within the Council.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



**PCYFF4 – Carbon Management**

<b>Rep ID</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan</b>	<b>Officers comments and recommendations</b>
81	Adran Cynllunio a Thai, Cyngor Sir Ddinbych (Angela Loftus) [2719]	POLICY PCYFF4	Support	Support this detailed and workable policy.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
385	Mon a Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills) [2937]	POLICY PCYFF4	Object	There appears to have been a failure to identify any strategic sites where energy efficiency measures should exceed the regulatory building standard. Planning Policy Wales, edn. 5, paras. 6.6 and 6.7 is relevant in this respect, as is the letter from Carl Sargeant, dated 5 June 2014, which states that "In formulating their Local Development Plans, LPAs should continue to assess their strategic sites to identify opportunities to require higher than regulatory (sustainable building) standards". We therefore consider that, with regard to housing/energy efficiency, the Deposit JLDP fails consistency test C2 and coherence and effectiveness test CE2.	<b>Not accepted</b>  No strategic site has been allocated in the Plan. Therefore, there is no need to address energy efficiency measure in this respect.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the objector's representation.  <b>No change</b>
438	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	POLICY PCYFF4	Support	Ffestiniog Town Council supports this important policy to control carbon. Exciting plans to build housing and facilities that address the needs of the future should be supported.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
453	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY PCYFF4	Object	Bourne Leisure comments however that sustainable design and construction should be primarily sought via Building Regulations. However, the Company also notes that the initial design of a building in the planning process will need to consider the ability to meet Building Regulations' requirements in the future. This point of principle should be set out in the LDP, to ensure that no confusion arises. It is therefore unnecessary for the LDP to make reference to energy efficiency features and measures.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Whilst the Building Regulations play a major role in ensuring that new developments are sustainable in design and construction, the planning system still has a role to play in delivering sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1058	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY PCYFF4	Object	The renewable energy assessment could be used to improve the policy wording for PS6 and PCYFF4, as these stand they lack clarity. The energy assessment could make it clear what is expected and to what scale/ type of development the policies apply.	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>We agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The additional wording provides added value to the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The following sentence will be included in the policy to provide further clarity:</p> <p>“An energy assessment can help identify the most suitable carbon management options for a development and should be</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>undertaken prior to deciding upon the most suitable course of action to take. The potential options for energy efficiency and renewable energy generation are listed below.”</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF32</b></p>
1137	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY PCYFF4	Object	<p>It is not clear what requirement this policy imposes on developers in relation to the "Potential Options". For example, do all options need to be considered and at least one implemented or is it permissible for no options to be implemented if evidence is presented showing that none of the options is feasible? It would be beneficial to reword this policy so that the particular obligation(s) are identified more clearly.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The ‘Potential Options’ are possible choices for applicants, not obligations. The level of energy efficiency required in new build development is set by the Building Regulations. The purpose of the policy is to set parameters for what carbon management measures are likely to be acceptable in planning terms.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to the policy.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**PCYFF5 – Water Conservation**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
401	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY PCYFF5	Support	DCWW support the requirement that proposals should incorporate water conservation measures where practicable, including Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS). The tackling of surface water at source is a vital component of sustainable development and will go a long way to mitigate against overloading sewers which can ultimately lead to flooding. The Floods and Water Management Act 2010 reinforces the obligations for developers to incorporate sustainable drainage systems as part of their developments.	<p><b>Note supporting comment.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

## Renewable Energy Technology

### PS7 – Renewable Energy Technology

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1080	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey)	7.2.23	Object	It refers to the Welsh Government's Energy Policy Statement (2010). This has been superseded by Energy Wales: A Low Carbon Transition (2012).	<b>Accept</b> – agree to change the reference to the appropriate new document to ensure the accuracy of the Plan.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[1561]				<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Change paragraph 7.2.23 to refer to the Energy Wales 2012 document.</p> <p><b>Minor Change NB4</b></p>
180,  181	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686],  Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY PS7	Object	Consider this policy is repetitive of national policy e.g. (not all landscapes are of the same value). The policy is too restrictive and not positive toward renewable energy technologies on existing mineral extractions sites or toward previously used land.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – there are very special environmental assets in the area, which have been recognised and designated on a national and international level. Therefore, the area attracts a vast number of tourists / visitors, who make an important contribution to the local economy.</p> <p>Whilst Renewable Energy policies promote renewable technology or low carbon initiatives, it's important that such developments don't compromise the area's biodiversity or landscape designation objectives.</p> <p>Policy ADN1 'On-shore Wind Energy' refers to medium-scale wind farms/turbines (5MW to 25MW) on urban brownfield/industrial sites which could include mineral excavation sites. For any other type of renewable energy, policy ADN2 may support large-scale proposals in exceptional circumstances, where an overriding need for the scheme can be justified.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
607	Mr Paul Madden [3032]	POLICY PS7	Object	<p>No mention is made of protecting tourist / visitor amenity. Tourism is the most important industry on Anglesey and as such should be protected.</p> <p>Amend criteria (i) and (iii) through adding 'tourism' to the reference towards 'residential amenity'.</p> <p>Criteria (ii) to be amended to read "ii. that installations in areas covered by international, national or local nature conservation designations in accordance with PS16 do not individually or cumulatively compromise the objectives of the designations".</p>	<p><b>Accept in part</b> - no robust evidence has been published which shows significant impact on tourism in an area due to the effect of wind turbines. A publication is available on the Welsh Government's website which refers to 'The Economic Impact of Wind Farms on Tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that there was limited evidence that wind farms impacted tourism in Wales.</p> <p>An assessment of any application for a turbine would assess its impact on any building in the vicinity, whether residential or tourism. The employment evidence base in the Plan outlines the importance of the tourism industry within the Plan area, and that the industry has a number of different facilities across the countryside in the Plan area. In light of this, and in order to ensure consistency with Strategic Policy PS11 (The Visitor Economy) it is recommended that clause (i) and (iii) are changed to read housing or</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>residential amenity used by visitors.</p> <p>It is believed that the wording of criterion (ii) as it stands, is appropriate, and the objector's suggestion is not accepted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That clause (i) and (iii) are amended to include reference to housing amenity used by visitors.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF34</b></p>
662	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PS7	Support	We also support the principles laid out in PS7 which describe that renewable energy installations should not individually or cumulatively compromise the objectives of designated protected landscape areas, including areas 'visible beyond their boundaries', and 'especially with regard to landscape character, biodiversity or residential amenity.'	<p><b>Note the supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
765	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS7	Object	PS3 states in the context of information and communications technology infrastructure that 'to lessen the visual impact of new overhead lines associated with developments, especially in sensitive locations, they should be placed underground.' This should also apply to electricity transmission cables, particularly in relation to new renewable energy developments, where limitation of visual impact on the landscape is particularly important. Moreover, the possible cumulative loading implications of new projects for capacity of the existing transmission lines should be clearly established to avoid unforeseen needs for later upgrading of overhead lines with a resulting risk of adverse visual impact. It is not enough to leave these matters in the hands of the District Network Operator.	<p><b>Accept</b> – as the objector notes, a clause has been included in policy PS3 to promote placing new lines underground to lessen their visual impact. No objections were received to this during the public consultation on the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>Whilst there are circumstances where planning permission is not required in order to install lines, it is believed that introducing this principle within policy PS7 provides an opportunity to the Councils to request this in order to lessen the visual impact of new infrastructure serving renewable energy developments, subject to other recognised considerations and the plan's viability.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add a clause to policy PS7 to refer to installing new lines underground.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF34</b></p>
1420	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	POLICY PS7	Object	The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development:	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – it is believed that the current policy supports renewable energy developments that are appropriate to their settings in terms of size and design.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				* provision of renewable energy which is appropriate in terms of its scale and design to its location.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### ADN1 – On-Shore Wind Energy

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
71	Nefyn Town Council (Liz Saville Roberts) [2710]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Nefyn Town Council is firm in its opinion that it is necessary to adhere to policy C26 involving the size of wind turbines in the Llyn AONB, and that an increase in the size of wind turbines should not be permitted.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan’s area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
74	Mr David Coucill [2629]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Wind turbines of 50m to tip height cannot be classified as small. This is especially true in the relatively flat landscape of Anglesey where a 50m structure, the height of ~8-storey building, can be seen from miles around.</p> <p>After a consultation, in which almost 10% of the population of Anglesey participated, Anglesey County Council adopted a minimum separation between turbines and domestic properties of 20 times tip height. This has been completely ignored.</p> <p>The effect of wind turbine noise on neighbouring properties is ignored in Gillespie's report even though it is recognised as a problem in other areas, e.g. Devon.</p> <p>The SPG on wind turbines approved by Anglesey Council after extensive</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>consultation should not be ignored and should be incorporated into the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to justify the inclusion of separation distances between turbines and houses; therefore, no change to the policy is recommended for this.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
75	Mrs Carolyn Williams [2721]	POLICY ADN1	Object	I am objecting to Policy ADN1. Most of Gwynedd is protected from developments by being a National Park (Snowdonia) or SLA (Lleyn Peninsular). Only Anglesey is open to wide-spread abuse.	<b>Not accepted</b> – All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>8000 islanders, who signed a petition in 2012, calling for a 1.5 km separation distance between homes and industrial commercial turbines and the Supplementary Planning Guidance is thrown out.</p> <p>I reject the wind energy policy as presented in this flawed, undemocratic and unsustainable Plan.</p> <p>The 1.5 km separation distance and the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Onshore Wind Energy should be retained.</p> <p>No more 50 metre (large) wind turbines. We are swamped.</p> <p>Anglesey's Councillors should listen and support their local communities, who don't want 50 metre plus wind turbines blighting the landscapes of Anglesey, and so must reject this draft wind energy policy.</p> <p>Our Communities have not consulted or</p>	<p>has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				agreed to be an energy island.	<p>separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
99	Mr Nigel Ayliffe [2639]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1. Distance from Residential Property</p> <p>Considerable consultation took place on this point both with the public and the Councillors in the drafting and agreeing of the Supplementary Planning Guide. Despite this evidence of the will of the people it has not been included in the above Plan. It should not be ignored. The agreed minimum distances should be entered.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>2. Repowering of existing wind farms/turbines. The planning considerations for these should be the same as those for new proposed turbines otherwise the damage already done to the countryside and tourist attractions will be compounded with the new much larger turbines.</p>	<p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The support for medium-scale wind farms / turbines on urban/industrial brownfield sites reflects the guidance within paragraphs 2.11 to 2.14 in TAN 8.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
100	Mr Christopher Marjot [2624]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1. Object to the classification of 50m wind-turbines as being 'small', this appears to be based more on power output, rather than height. The environmental and amenity impact is directly proportional to the height of the wind-turbine, not the power output. 50m wind-turbines are not 'small' relative to the size of dwellings and the local environment. The classification should be redefined to accurately reflect their scale relative to residences and the local environment. *</p> <p>2. The Anglesey SPG on 'Onshore Wind Energy' recommended far more suitable distances from residences to wind-turbine the JLDP should conform to the SPG separation distances.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
131	Mr Mark Edwards [2769]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Wind turbines have been proven to discourage tourism. NW Wales is highly dependent on the business provided by its visitors. Any thing other than micro scale turbines must therefore be ruled out.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>The definition of a "small wind turbine" at up to 50m high o/a is badly judged. This is around 10x the ridge height of a traditional cottage.</p> <p>Distances from residences in table 14 are about 50% of what is reasonable.</p> <p>The words "significant harm" in clauses iii and iv of the conformation criteria fails to show due respect and consideration for the needs of local residents and needs amendment.</p> <p>Overall limitation to micro and domestic turbines requires amendment of items 1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>Table 13 needs to be changed to give realistic height categories.</p> <p>Distances in Table 14 should be doubled.</p>	<p>impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				Amended wording for criteria iii. and iv. given.	<p>recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
166	Mr DAVID THOMAS [2775]	POLICY ADN1	Object	After much consultation there is an SPG which has been agreed and accepted but does not seem to be implemented in the Deposit plan Why? There should be a minimum distance from residential	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>buildings specified. What is there now to stop more turbines being erected across Anglesey? The island in my opinion is already saturated with wind turbines and any more will ruin its character and attraction for tourist to come and visit.</p> <p>SPG provisions for wind turbines to be implemented.</p> <p>A distance of at least 1.5 km between residential property and a turbine to be specified.</p>	<p>document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
177,  194	Rod Dixon [2774],  Mrs Irene Stott [2780]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>ADN1 point 2. This should refer to the agreed Onshore Wind Energy SPGs of both Councils which state that the maximum tip height for the designated sizes of turbines will be: micro - 11m; small - 20m; medium - 65m; large - 135m. The councils were assured that these would be carried forward to the LDP, they have not been and the new categories are much increased over the originals.</p> <p>Revert to old agreed sizes</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
201	Kingsbridge Caravan Park (Mr Andrew Bate) [2778]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Onshore wind turbines on Anglesey should be restricted to "Domestic" use and located near the associated dwelling.	<b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Proliferation of larger machines around the island will have a negative impact on the landscape and may cause visitors to seek alternative less industrialised locations.</p> <p>There will be significant visual impairment with the construction of additional transmission lines associated with extra generation capacity from Wylfa B.</p> <p>Generation capacity from proposed offshore wind farms and Wylfa B will far outweigh that which onshore generation could achieve so preserve the onshore landscape of "unspoilt countryside and coastline" as highlighted in the Visitor Economy Introduction.</p> <p>Restrict onshore wind turbines to "Domestic" grade.</p>	<p>different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>No evidence has been presented by the objector to justify a restriction to Domestic scale throughout the Plan area.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p>Criterion (vi) in the policy refers to cumulative impacts which include any prominent landscape features.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
299	Mr Owain Evans [2837]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>In 2012/13 Anglesey Council compiled, consulted and agreed a SPG which specified limits on the growth of wind turbines. This Deposit Plan completely ignores those decisions.</p> <p>I want to see the provisions of the SPG with respect to wind turbines and passed in 2012/13 to replace the JLDP provisions contained in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
305	Mr Barry Roberts [2878]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>I object to the plan as it classifies up to 3, 50 metre wind turbines as small scale. The plan also states most of Gwynedd is protected from developments by being a National Park (Snowdonia) or SLA (Llyn Peninsular). Only Anglesey is open to wide-spread abuse, and it will be abused. There was an agreement that minimum distance would be considered by Anglesey planners and councillors after the 2013 SPG was adopted due to 8,000 strong petitions demanding a minimum distance. Once again a minimum distance has been ignored. So much for democracy!</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
312	Cyfeillion Llŷn (Mrs Sian Parri) [2871]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Ban turbines from the AONB. No turbine higher than 11.1 in the SLA and Landscape of Special Historical Interest. Listen to the advice of the AONB Consultative Committee which considers that it is necessary to adhere to the above in order to conform to the Council's statutory duty under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
388	Môn a Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills)	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>ADN1 and the criteria in the associated Table 13 appear to restrict many wind energy developments of less than 5 MW to within SSAs and urban/industrial brownfield sites. This would be in</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>The conclusions of this work was that micro-scale</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[2937]			<p>contravention of TAN8, which states, "...the Assembly Government would support local planning authorities in introducing local policies in their development plans that restrict almost all wind energy developments, larger than 5 MW, to within SSAs and urban/industrial brownfield sites." We also consider ADN1 to be unsound in failing to take adequate account of the importance of community-based/-owned projects and repowering schemes.</p>	<p>and small-scale (up to 5MW) outside the AONB, SLA and the setting of the National Park and World Heritage Site could be supported. To ensure consistency with the evidence base we propose a focussed change to refer to the setting of the AONB and SLA.</p> <p>Therefore, the Plan supports proposals up to 5MW outside areas with a landscape designation or an area that affects their settings provided the criteria within the policy has been satisfied.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
477	CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd (Mr John Cocking)	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The wording of the first line is unnecessarily restrictive. The wording of points 1, 2 and 3 is unnecessarily prescriptive. Both should be amended</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – the wording within the policy reflects the evidence base contained within the Background Paper Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014). This reflects the extremely special</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[1558]			to reflect a more flexible and proactive approach to wind farm development. Applications should be determined on their merits on a case-by-case basis	<p>environmental assets within the Plan's area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
531	John Bircham [2989]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Wind turbines have an unacceptable visual impact on a rural countryside. The concrete base for each turbine will be forever long after turbines have gone with the grants.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – The criteria within the policy have regard to the visual impact of a proposal and also that an appropriate restoration and aftercare scheme is in place.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
532	Jason Bowes [2991]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Although renewable wind energy is needed it is not needed in this format. Small wind turbines are not 50m. Maybe 10-15m. 15-30m turbines to be sited at least 1.5km from nearest dwelling. 30m turbines sited as wind farms as far from view as possible. I would not like Anglesey to be ruined by these monstrosities. Let farmer's site small turbines 10-15m for their own needs.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
535	Brian Lee [2993]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1) The SPG should be honoured</p> <p>2) The existing height classification should be accepted</p> <p>3) A separation distance of 1.5km</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>should also be accepted</p> <p>4) The JLDP should be re-written acknowledging the wishes of Anglesey residents</p>	<p>according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p data-bbox="1352 309 1973 379">developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1352 488 1989 1139">Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p data-bbox="1352 1246 1574 1273"><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
538	Janis Evans [2994]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The Deposit Plan ignores the Anglesey Council SPG which specifies limits on the growth of wind turbines. The Plan classifies 50 metre high wind turbines as 'small-scale'. The island's entire interior could be transformed by developments of this scale and type if the Plan proceeds. No other huge industrial scale developments are given such free reign.</p> <p>8000 islanders who signed a petition in 2012 calling for a 1.5km separation distance between homes and industrial commercial turbines are being ignored.</p> <p>I want the provisions of the SPG with</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>respect to wind turbines to replace the provisions contained in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
539	David Talbot [2995]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1) The Plan classifies 50 metres high wind turbines as 'small scale', over 6 times the height of an average house!</p> <p>2) Most of the turbines in the existing wind farms in the north of the island are now 'small'. The Island's entire interior can be transformed by developments of this scale and type if the Plan proceeds.</p> <p>3) 8000 signatures on Anglesey expressed the wish of a minimum of 1.5km separation distance with large wind turbines and residency. None is given.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
540	Tudweiliog Community Council (Mrs Glenys Peters) [1236]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Recommend that turbines that are higher than 15m should not be permitted in Gwynedd, and none in an Area of Natural Beauty. Tudweiliog Community Council objects to every wind turbine within the Llŷn AONB and every application for a turbine higher than 11m within the boundary and views of the AONB.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan’s area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the evidence base there is an intention to change criteria 2 &amp; 3 within the policy through including reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
541	Mrs Pam Lee [2725]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The following should be accepted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The 2012/13 SPG</li> <li>2) A separation distance of 1.5km</li> <li>3) Reclassification of 'small-scale'</li> </ol>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
542	Dr Stephen Baker [2623]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The plan classifies 50metre high turbines as 'small scale'</p> <p>This means that most of the existing Anglesey turbines are 'small' - unreasonable</p> <p>Public consultation seems to be ignored</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p data-bbox="1352 379 1951 488">Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1352 596 1487 624"><b>No Change</b></p>
543	Richard & Sheila Perry [2996]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p data-bbox="842 699 1330 1267">We object to the resizing criteria of turbines - 50 m high now being considered 'small scale'. In fact these are very visible from many locations across the north part of the island, the coast path and AONB. Visitors come to the island to enjoy the landscapes of the AONB/coast and are providers of much of the vital summer income for Anglesey's tourism businesses. They will not enjoy their visit if all they can see across the island are far taller wind turbines, more widely spread than at present.</p>	<p data-bbox="1352 667 1995 1230"><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
544	Mr Stephen Kneale [2776]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>This Plan completely ignores decisions which were agreed after exhaustive public consultation. The Plan classifies 50m high win turbines as 'small-scale' which is absurd. The existing industrial Rhyd-y-Groes Amlwch wind farm would be "small-scale". Anglesey would be ruined as a tourists destination if further developments on this scale were allowed on the island. The height categories should be retained as specified in the existing SPG. The acceptable distance from dwellings should also be retained as specified in the SPG.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C).</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
545	Mrs Candy Jones [2758]	POLICY ADN1	Object	50m high is not a small wind turbine. The SPG is being ignored. The whole interior of the island could be covered in 50m turbines if the Plan is adopted.	<b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p data-bbox="1352 312 1995 667">different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p data-bbox="1352 778 1995 1054">All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p data-bbox="1352 1161 1574 1190"><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p data-bbox="1352 1299 1872 1327">Robust evidence was not received to justify</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
546	Elfed Jones [2999]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Small turbines should be 20m high, as specified in the SPG, not 50m high. The SPG is being ignored after an unprecedented response. This Plan would turn the interior of the island into one big wind farm of 'small' 50m turbines.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
547	Mr Nigel Ayliffe [2639]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Paragraph 7.2 onwards does not reflect aspects of the supplementary planning guidance which was produced after lengthy consultation with residents in 2012/13. The major points are:</p> <p>i) a minimum separation distance between resident's houses and industrial turbines of 1.5km.</p> <p>ii) Classifying 50m turbines as small is incomprehensible. It was agreed by residents that 'small' wind turbines (20/25m) should be allowed for farmers etc. 50m is not small, it is large industrial.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
548	Mr N.F. & Mrs C.W. Roberts [3000]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Common features are noise, the obvious blight on a landscape of natural beauty, and the significant effect on local businesses and local employment in catering and tourist industries. Turbines of the height proposed (up to 50m) will destroy views of the landscape and affect tourism.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
549	Mrs M.A.	POLICY ADN1	Object	a) 50 metre high turbines are not classified as small in the SPG. They are	<b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	Ayliffe [3001]			<p>20/25m high</p> <p>b) The north end of the island has most of the 'small' turbines in clusters which will cause problems for the local residents as set out in the SPG if they are increased to 50 metres</p> <p>c) That the council is ignoring the SPG of 2012/13 which was decided upon after exhaustive public consultation.</p>	<p>Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
550,	Mr DJ & Mrs JL Hart	POLICY ADN1	Object	The Plan classifies 50m high wind turbines as 'small-scale', over 6 times the height of an average house. Most	<b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
552, 554, 559, 576, 578, 688	[3002],  Gareth Porter [3004],  Ralph Morris [3005],  Jonathon Tivy-Jones [3010],  G. Warren [3018],  Julia Dobson [2979],  Mrs Frances Nigogosian			of the turbines in the existing wind farms in the north of the island are now 'small' and the island's entire interior can be transformed by developments of this scale and type if the plan proceeds. The SPG on Onshore Wind Energy, subject to exhaustive public consultations, is being thrown out.	<p>Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[3068]				<p>policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
551	Robert MacAulay [3003]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Paragraph 7.2 of policy ADN1 will have the effect of unconstrained building of large wind turbines across much of Anglesey. The two largest 'industries' on	<b>Not Accepted</b> – No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				the Island are farming and tourism and the proposed policy will serve to destroy or seriously reduce the latter by ruining the peace and (largely) uninterrupted vista's for which most tourists come. Whilst the proposal may produce a little more green energy for the UK, it will only serve to enrich a few to the huge detriment of the rest of the island's inhabitants and visitors	<p>of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
555	Isabel Hargreaves [3006]	POLICY ADN1	Object	In 2012/13 Ynys Môn agreed an SPG with specified constraints on wind turbines which the Deposit Plan has ignored. It has re-cast 50m turbines as 'small', the implications of this for future wind turbine development is huge and will have a deleterious effect on the natural rural beauty of the	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Island. Potential impact on tourism and quality of life of Ynys Môn residents will be significant and negative.</p> <p>8000 residents responded to the SPG consultation calling for a 1.5km separation between commercial turbines and residents.</p> <p>The provision of the 2013 SPG to replace the provisions within the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
556	Vicky Gregory [3007]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Onshore wind energy of the Plan states that 'small-scale wind energy proposals WILL be granted outside the AONB, SLA and the setting of the National park and World Heritage Site'. The Plan's classification of 'small scale' win turbine is 50m in height which is considerably higher than the classification held in the 2013 SPG. This has worrying implications for the island's future with the possibility of unspoilt landscapes being dramatically changed for years to come and areas in the north will continue to be industrialised on an even larger scale and dominate the landscape.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
557	John Alexander [3008]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The SPG and the amendments subject to consultation are being ignored. The re-classification of the scale of size of wind turbines will enable repowering smaller turbines in the north of the island. It will enable turbines to spread across the whole county (this is against TAN8 guidelines. No mention of buffer zones/wildlife corridors that can protect the key AONB areas. The SPG is being ignored. The distance of turbines from	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>properties that are quoted and would trigger an assessment are not acceptable and do not meet the public's requirements.</p> <p>The SPG that was passed in 2012/13 plus the amendments should replace the JLDP provisions in the Deposit Plan. Health and safety issues with regard to noise need to be properly taken into consideration. A buffer zone and wildlife corridor from the south to the north east of the island needs to be created. Turbines should not be permitted in this area. 50m turbines are not small and they are unsuitable for the topography of this island.</p>	<p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>(including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
558	Sarah Irlam [3009]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The Plan classifies 50 metre high wind turbines as 'small'. If the Plan proceeds, almost the whole of the island will be covered by developments of this scale. The SPG on onshore wind energy is being dismissed.</p> <p>I want to see the provision of the SPG with respect to wind turbines passed in</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>2012/13 to replace the JLDP provision contained in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>The landscape sensitivity and capacity for Anglesey, Gwynedd and SNP needs to be adhered to.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan must protect these special areas and more should be included, particularly the distance from AONB, SSSIs, SLAs, SACs.</p>	<p>not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The policy is based upon the evidence base in the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) which assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
560	Mr John E. Williams [3013]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>No attempt made to differentiate between Anglesey and Gwynedd in terms of constraints imposed by topography on planning applications emphasised by National Park and AONB. These impacts directly on land available for turbine planning applications. Approximately 20% of Gwynedd is not covered by either National Park or AONB. Approximately 80% of Anglesey is not covered by its AONB. The burden of repeated applications the energy companies therefore falls on Anglesey with the coast implications and the reduction of services borne by the Anglesey rate payer.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The evidence base to include this policy is in the background paper Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) which assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
561, 572	Dr B L Davies [3012],  Mrs E C Davies [3017]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The provisions of the SPG have not been incorporated in this Deposit Plan. Nearly 8000 residents signed a petition against the further development of commercial scale (&gt;15m to tip) wind turbines on the Island.</p> <p>New wind turbine development outside the area specified in para. 7.2.30 of the Plan should be restricted to domestic scale turbines (&lt;15m to tip) and should relate well to existing settlements/buildings and not scattered over open countryside.</p> <p>The only exception would be the repowering of existing turbines which should be replaced one-to-one by more efficient and less noisy turbines of the same height.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
562	Christopher and Eleni Marjot [3011]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Defining 50m wind turbines as 'small' is incorrect. They may be 'small' in terms of power output, but are NOT 'small' in proportion to residential properties and the landscape. The classification terminology needs to be amended so	<b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				that it is not deceiving.	<p>paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
564	Christopher and Eleni Marjot [3011]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The Anglesey SPG on 'Onshore Wind Energy' recommended far more suitable distances from residences to wind turbines. These have not been applied in the draft JLDP. I want the JLDP to conform to the recommendations for separation distances to follow that of	<b>Not Accepted</b> - Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				the Anglesey SPG.	<p>placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
565,	Jonathan Tivy-Jones [3010],	POLICY ADN1	Object	I object that the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Onshore Wind Energy SPG 2012/13 which was agreed	<b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
567	Mrs Erica Cooper [3015]			<p>after much public consultation is now ignored. Also ignored, is the petition by 8000 residents in 2012, who wanted a 1.5 km separation distance of commercial turbines, from residential areas for reasons of safety and aesthetics. This deposit plan has now re-classified 50 metre wind turbines as small-scale! How can they be called small when they are twice the height of the Marquis of Anglesey's Column? This plan, therefore, will pave the way for Anglesey's beauty to be disfigured, by littering it with turbines.</p>	<p>according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
566	Mrs Nanette Tivy-Jones [3014]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>In 2012/2013 Anglesey Council compiled, consulted and agreed an SPG which specified certain limits on the growth of wind turbines. This deposit plan does not comply at all with these decisions. This new deposit plan would reclassify wind turbines already present on the north of the island as small and would allow the interior of the island to be exploited for development. I strongly object to this, as it will have catastrophic effects on the island's significant tourist economy and wildlife. This level of flexibility is not given to other industrial scale developments of this kind on the island.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism'</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>(February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
568	Mr John E. Williams [3013]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Table 14 is unrealistic. Uses visual impact criteria which do not include cognitive, psychological and mechanical implications. The separation distances have been tailored to fit the largest possible turbines into the confined areas available on Anglesey and Gwynedd without adequate reflection of practices elsewhere in Britain and abroad. This section needs to be re-titled as a Physical/Mental Impact Zone and the concerns of the 8000 rate payers who signed the petition of 2012 adequately reflected. 1.5km separation</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				distance should be adopted.	<p>residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
577	Trevor Jones [3019]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The plan ignores the previously agreed SPG limiting the growth of wind turbines. It will, if adopted, give free rein to unfettered development of large win turbines on an industrial scale. It cannot be allowed that this Guidance should be ignored.</p> <p>Changes: the proposals regarding the height and distribution of wind turbines contained therein be removed and replaced by the recommendations as stated in the SPG.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey’s existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan’s Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The evidence base behind the policy sets out the height up to which can be supported if the criteria within the policy can be satisfied.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
579	Dr Morag McGrath [231]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The proposals completely ignore the 2013 SPG on onshore wind turbines. In particular the sizes of turbines permitted in the various categories have been greatly increased.</p> <p>Changes: The categorisation of onshore turbine size in the 2013 SPG and the relevant proposals should be reinstated.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
580	Dr Morag McGrath [231]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The 2013 SPG set out a minimum separation distance from residential or tourist properties of 500m or 20 times the tip height of the blades, which the greater. The SPG has been totally ignored in this document. Table 14	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>refers only to the visual impact whereas the problem of noise is also relevant.</p> <p>Change: Reinstate the policies concerning minimum separation distances between onshore wind turbines and residential or tourist properties given in the 2013 SPG.</p>	<p>Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
581	Nigel Peacock [3021]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Wind turbines other than domestic wind turbines should not be permitted anywhere in the plan area.</p> <p>Changes: the plan should give protection to the environment and</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>countryside not only in relation to the provision of holiday accommodation but also in relation to the construction of much more damaging wind turbines.</p>	<p>policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
582	Mr David G. Thomas [3020]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>I object to the parameters set for wind turbines on Anglesey. They do not include the restrictions agreed in the Strategic Planning Guidelines passed by A.C.C. On 24th. January 2013 and confirmed to be included in the LDP by the Joint Local Development Panel on 7th. March 2014. The LDP does not have regard to the effect of wind-</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				turbines on the sky-line of Anglesey and the tourist industry on which it is so much dependent. Restrictions should be clear to avoid inappropriate applications and expensive appeals. The Plan as drawn is ripe for exploitation by rich developers	<p>base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
583	Mr Ralph Morris [3022]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Anglesey Council agreed a SPG which specified limits on the growth of wind turbines. This plan completely ignores	<b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>those decisions. The plan classifies 50 metre high wind turbines as small-scale, over 6 times the height of an average house! As if by magic, most of the turbines in the existing wind farms in the north of the island are small, and the island's entire interior can be transformed by developments of this scale and type if the plan proceeds. No other huge industrial scale developments are given such free rein.</p>	<p>according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
584	Gillian Coates [3023]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The Deposit Plan will turn Anglesey into a giant wind farm. I object to 50 metre wind turbines being defined as 'small-scale'.</p> <p>Change: I want to see the provisions of the SPG with respect to wind turbines, and passed in 2012/2013, to replace the JLDP provisions contained in the</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				Deposit Plan.	<p>be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
585	Mr David G. Thomas [3020]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The LDP does not have regard to the effect of wind-turbines on the sky-line of Anglesey and the tourist industry on which it is so much dependent. Restrictions should be clear to avoid inappropriate applications and expensive appeals. Change: i) Insert "Small-scale and" before "medium scale..." ii) "Micro-scale" - delete "and small-scale" wind turbines....outside the AONB insert "or a buffer zone of two kilometres", SLA iii) Policy AND2 "All proposals should conform to the following criteria: vii At end after</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				"agreed" Add "before the commencement of any works".	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
586, 587	Philip Tolman [3024], Honey Tolman [3025]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The Plan ignores the SPG which sets limits on wind turbines. Absurdly, the Plan classifies 50m turbines as small scale. Anglesey's rural beauty could be destroyed forever by massive developments that would never be permitted for other industrial projects. The SPG adopted a 1.5km separation distance between homes and large turbines. This is ignored.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
588	Janet Smith [2990]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Objection: To the re-classification 50 metre high wind turbines as 'small-scale'.</p> <p>Objection: To the consequence of this re-classification that existing wind farms in the north of the island would be</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>'small', opening the way for the transformation of the Island to large scale industrial development.</p> <p>Objection: The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy, subject to exhaustive public consultations, is being thrown out.</p> <p>The provisions of the SPG with respect to wind turbines and passed in 2012/13 to replace the JLDP provisions contained in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
589,  590	Dorothy Prestwich [3026],  Mr & Mrs K Street [3027]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Object to large (50m +) turbines being built all over the Island. SPG has been totally ignored.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
591	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mrs Maureen Parry Williams) [1441]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Policy ADN1 is flawed planning policy for Anglesey and is unsound.</p> <p>A policy that restricts the areas where new wind turbines can be built is essential for Anglesey.</p> <p>The SLA status must be restored to most of the island's interior landscape.</p> <p>The heights of permissible new turbine developments must be reduced to those listed in the 2012 SPG Consultation.</p> <p>There must be Buffer Zones between turbines and residential properties as per the 2013 SPG.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The objector wants to see the entire centre of Anglesey designated as a Special Landscape Area (SLA) as it was in the Isle of Anglesey's Local Plan. In paragraph 5.3.11 of Planning Policy Wales, it is explained that <b>non-statutory designations</b>, such as Special Landscape Areas, should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the site's value in terms of nature, landscape or geology.</p> <p>The SLA identified in the Plan is based on the work of the Review of Gwynedd and Anglesey Special Landscape Areas (2012). Whilst the centre of the Island had been identified as a SLA in the Local Plan, it was not in the UDP and it stopped identifying any part of the Island as an SLA. The objectors have not submitted evidence to justify designating the entire centre of the Island as a SLA, contrary to the findings of the Plan's evidence base and consequently, no recommendation to change the Plan is made.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
593	Lawrence Cotter [3028]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The 2013 SPG is ignored. 50 metre wind turbines which are double the height of the Marquis of Anglesey's Column, now classed as 'small-scale', with no public consultation.</p> <p>Change: the provisions regarding onshore wind turbines that were agreed in the SPG 2013 document should be upheld and maintained in the Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
596 & 601	Cwm Cadnant Community	POLICY ADN1	Object	Policy ADN1 in its present form does not show good judgement. It will have a	<b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	Council (Mr Alun Foulkes) [1273]			<p>detrimental impact and is not a sustainable environmental, social, economic and cultural land use plan for Anglesey.</p> <p>Point 1 should restrict turbine height to 50 metres to blade tip. Point 2 should restrict turbine height to 15 metres to blade tip. Point 3 should restrict turbine height to 11.1 metres to blade tip.</p> <p>The criteria listed in i) to vii) should be expanded to offer better protection to local as well as national designations and assets.</p>	<p>Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Whilst criteria (i) to (vii) refers to national assets they are also applicable in addition to local assets e.g. landscape character, biodiversity etc.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
603	John & Ann Baum [3031]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The 2012/2013 SPG on Onshore Wind Energy is being ignored.	<b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>50 metre high turbines are being classified as small-scale - at six times the height of an average house.</p> <p>Many existing turbines on wind farms on the island would be classed as small, thus opening up possibilities for extensive industrial type developments.</p> <p>We should like the 2012/2013 SPG provisions applied to wind turbines to replace the JLDP proposals contained in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
608	Mr Paul Madden [3032]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>As worded criteria (iii) is bad English and it would appear that words may of have been omitted and the word 'significant' should be dropped.</p> <p>The Health Impact Assessment refers to minimising potential health impact caused by noise but not detailed policies in regard to health impact are included within this section.</p> <p>There is no recognition that wind</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – Agree that criterion (iii) could be re-worded to better explain that factors such as noise, public health etc. will be factors to consider with any proposal.</p> <p>The term significant is a term used in Planning and it is felt appropriate to keep it within the policy.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>turbines and their proximity can result in ill-health for residents.</p> <p>The report on separation distances is concerned only with landscape and visual matters. The Council should have commissioned an independent report to deal with ill-health from noise emissions.</p>	<p>noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>It is not felt appropriate for the Councils top commission work on health impact from noise when this information is a requirement on individual applications. Since the effects from noise will be different from location to location it is reasonable to conclude that undertaking such a study on a county level would provide definitive answers, and therefore this would not be an effective use of resources.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					That criterion (iii) is re-worded.  <b>Focussed Change NF35</b>
690	Mr John Irlam [3069]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Minimum separation distances should be considered as noted in 'Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties Study'. Wind turbines in close proximity to dwellings would have an adverse effect. The JLDP should recognise the separation distances.	<b>Not Accepted</b> - Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.  As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
694	Mrs Kate Barker [2857]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The document is unsound because some policies appear to be made on inaccurate generalisations, and there is	<b>Not Accepted</b> – The public consultation period is set out within Part 4 of the Town & Country Planning (LDP) (Wales) Regulations 2005. The Deposit Plan

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>not enough detail on some issues, for example, the importance of the landscape around heritage assets - there is no mechanism to show these areas on the constraint maps. The document is also unsound because it does not take into account previous public consultation responses on the LDP where 800 people wrote in about their concerns in wind turbine development in 2012.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public consultation period should be extended.</li> <li>2. Maps should be re-issued so they do not pixilate when you zoom in.</li> <li>3. Height of wind turbines not exceeding 15m to tip height should replace 50m stated in the plan.</li> <li>4. A set back distance from dwellings should be observed of 1.5 or 2 kilometres because of health and loss of amenity.</li> <li>5. We need a mechanism and clear route for appeal against the grant of</li> </ol>	<p>was consulted upon for 6 weeks in line with this regulation.</p> <p>It is assumed that the reference to maps is in relation to the constraints maps that provided information about the different landscape/ environmental designations that exist within the plan area e.g. AONB etc. These are not part of the consultation, but rather for information and different designations have been prepared at different scales and therefore not appropriate to be seen at a lower scale.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>approval in planning decisions other than through the courts.</p> <p>6. The area surrounding the heritage asset should also be shown as a protected area on the constraints maps, not the just the asset itself.</p>	<p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>The appeal system and changes to it our outside the remit of a planning development plan process.</p> <p>Different types of heritage assets would have different size of area that affects their setting. In light of this it is not appropriate to show an area around heritage assets as areas to be protected.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
705	Lesley Alexander [3073]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Community Council views and objections to the spread of medium and large industrial turbines are ignored in the JLDP. Wildlife corridors and buffer zones around the AONB are not	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>included. The effects on tourism and visual impact on the landscape will be catastrophic on Anglesey unless the JLDP is amended. The separation distance from domestic dwellings is suggested to be 400m from a large turbine! A petition in 2012, done as part of the SPG consultation asked for 1.5km.</p> <p>The deposit plan must be changed to include the SPG amendments on turbines, their height classification, separation distances and effect on tourism, wildlife and health of local inhabitants e.g. noise.</p>	<p>document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Criterion (ii) gives consideration to the effects on</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>biodiversity which will include wildlife corridors.</p> <p>A buffer to the AONB was introduced in the Ynys Môn SPG for On-shore Wind Energy on the day the SPG was adopted. Planning Inspectors have not been giving weight to this buffer from the AONB, see the appeals on applications 37C174C (Tre Ifan, Brynsiencyn) and 38C277B (Caerdegog Uchaf, Llanfechell). In addition, the AONB management plan does not identify a specific distance as a buffer from the designation. The effects of a proposal on views in and out of the AONB will depend upon the nature of the proposal and the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
706	Gwyneth Jones [3074]	POLICY ADN1	Object	I object to the scale proposed in relation to the height of proposed turbines within a landscape such as that of Anglesey, especially given the developments that have already taken place. I would welcome adopting the	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				previous policies found in the 2013 SPG	<p>considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
711	Anglesey Against Wind Turbines (Ms Mairede Thomas)	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Policy ADN1 is flawed, unjustifiable and unsound for the reasons given in Section 2c of the JLDP representation form.</p> <p>There should be separation distances</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – it is agreed to include a reference to house amenities used by visitors. However, further changes are not accepted for the following reasons.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[318]			<p>between turbines and homes. Especially to lessen the effect of noise on housing in the vicinity.</p> <p>The SLA status should be restored to the interior landscapes of Anglesey.</p> <p>Table 13 should use the turbine heights used in the 2012 SPG.</p> <p>Any policy on wind turbine development must take account of the depressive economic impact on houses and other property and on the island's economy and its tourist trade in particular.</p> <p>The protections for tourism amenity contained in the 1996 Ynys Môn Local Plan must be included in any policy regarding wind turbines.</p>	<p>for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to justify the inclusion of separation distances between turbines and houses; therefore, no change to the policy is recommended for this.</p> <p>The objector wants to see the entire centre of Anglesey designated as a Special Landscape Area (SLA) as it was in the Isle of Anglesey's Local Plan. In paragraph 5.3.11 of Planning Policy Wales, it is explained that <b>non-statutory designations</b>, such as Special Landscape Areas, should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the site's value in terms of nature, landscape or geology.</p> <p>The SLA identified in the Plan is based on the work of the Review of Gwynedd and Anglesey Special Landscape Areas (2012). Whilst the centre of the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Island had been identified as a SLA in the Local Plan, it was not in the UDP and it stopped identifying any part of the Island as an SLA. The objectors have not submitted evidence to justify designating the entire centre of the Island as a SLA, contrary to the findings of the Plan's evidence base and consequently, no recommendation to change the Plan is made.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>As a matter of general principle, planning is concerned with land use from the point of view of the public interest and is not concerned with private rights as such.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p>The purpose of clause (iii) of the policy is to outline strategic support for wind energy developments outside designated landscapes, but also to list matters that should not be subject to substantial harm as a result of the development. This list includes residential amenities but does not refer to tourist use, which is what the objector wishes to see. An assessment of any application for a turbine would assess its impact on any building in the vicinity, be that a residential or tourist building. The Plan's employment evidence base outlines the importance of the tourism industry in the Plan area and that the industry has a number of various facilities across the countryside in the Plan's area. In light of this, and to ensure consistency with Strategic Policy PS11 (The Visitor Economy), it is recommended that clause (iii) is changed to read 'residential or house amenities used by visitors'.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Change clause (iii) to refer to house amenities used by visitors.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF35</b></p>
713	Mr John Eric Williams [2746]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The term 'Wind Turbines' rather than 'Windmills' should be used. The term 'windmills' is associated with corn mills.</p> <p>Paragraph 2. I completely disagree with the proposal to permit wind turbines outside the AONB, the National Parks and SLAs if these are visible from these sites. This type of development could be just as harmful to the site.</p> <p>Paragraph 3. I completely disagree with the proposal to permit domestic wind turbines within the AONB, National Parks and Heritage Sites.</p> <p>These recommendations are contrary to existing policies and weaken and</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – Accept that the reference to 'melinau' in the Welsh version should be amended to 'tyrbinau'.</p> <p>From reviewing the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment study it is clear that when referring to Landscape Protection the setting of the AONB and SLA is listed in addition to the setting of the National park and World Heritage Site. In light of this it is recommended that the wording within the policy is amended through including reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA in criterion 2 &amp; 3.</p> <p>The evidence base to the Deposit Plan within the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) study assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				undermine efforts to safeguard the heritage that is in our care.	<p>of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The term 'tyrbinau gwynt' replace 'melinau gwynt' in the Welsh version and that criterion 2 &amp; 3 contain reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF35, NF36</b></p> <p><b>Minor Change NB5, NB6, NB7</b></p>
894	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY ADN1	Object	A limit of 11m rather than 15m height for domestic turbines would accord better with permitted development limits. Difference between capacity and output should be clarified. We oppose removal of the present progressive and clearcut policy in Gwynedd of excluding wind turbines from the AONB. Support	<b>Accepted in part</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>the proposal to limit turbines to domestic size in SLAs - should emphasise this includes within AONB's. SLA coverage should be extended to buffer some areas of the AONB which are less protected in N.Llyn and the Menai shore. Height limits should apply in repowering. Residential visual amenity distance criteria should be strengthened. Farm diversification criteria from the Gwynedd SPG should be included in the policy. There should be more reference to archaeological impact and a definition of community-based projects. Suggested changes:  ADN1/2: "...outside the AONB, SLA, and the SETTINGS OF THE AONB, National Park..."  ADN1/3 "In the AONB, SLA and the SETTING OF THE AONB, National Park and World Heritage Site..."  Extend SLA coverage to provide more effective buffer areas for designated area.  In area LCA GU10 follow LSCS guidance</p>	<p>within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assess the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p>The objector wants to see the Special Landscape Area (SLA) extended. In paragraph 5.3.11 of Planning Policy Wales, it is explained that <b>non-statutory designations</b>, such as Special Landscape Areas, should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the site's value in terms of nature, landscape or geology.</p> <p>The SLA identified in the Plan is based on the work of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>in limiting turbines to 'micro' scale.  ADN1/3 delete 'the AONB'  Add ADN1/4 "Wind turbine applications in the AONB will be refused"  4.17 Para 7.2.30 Insert 'acceptable'?  'The setting of the National Park and World Heritage Site limits the ACCEPTABLE..."  Table 13: Domestic height limit, clarify kW as a capacity not output; reduce 'small' indicative output level.  Add criteria related to farm usage limits, archaeological impact  Modify residential amenity distance limits.</p>	<p>the Review of Gwynedd and Anglesey Special Landscape Areas (2012). Whilst the centre of the Island had been identified as a SLA in the Local Plan, it was not in the UDP and it stopped identifying any part of the Island as an SLA. The objectors have not submitted evidence to justify designating the entire centre of the Island as a SLA, contrary to the findings of the Plan's evidence base and consequently, no recommendation to change the Plan is made.</p> <p>From reviewing the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment study it is clear that when referring to Landscape Protection the setting of the AONB and SLA is listed in addition to the setting of the National park and World Heritage Site. In light of this it is recommended that the wording within the policy is amended through including reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA in criterion 2 &amp; 3.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That criterion 2 &amp; 3 contain reference to the setting of the AONB &amp; SLA.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<b>Focused Change NF35</b>
950	AONB Joint Advisory Committee (Cynghorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>I believe that the current policy of having no turbines in the AONB (C26) should be adhered to.</p> <p>Also, refuse turbines higher than 11m within visibility of the AONB.</p> <p>The term 'turbine' should be used, rather than 'mill' which is different.</p> <p>I believe that criterion 2 should refer to safeguarding the setting of the AONB.</p> <p>There is concern about the categories and designating developments under 5MW as 'Small'.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – Accept that the reference to 'melinau' in the Welsh version should be amended to 'tyrbinau'.</p> <p>From reviewing the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment study it is clear that when referring to Landscape Protection the setting of the AONB and SLA is listed in addition to the setting of the National park and World Heritage Site. In light of this it is recommended that the wording within the policy is amended through including reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA in criterion 2 &amp; 3.</p> <p>The evidence base to the Deposit Plan within the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) study assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The term 'tyrbinau gwynt' replace 'melinau gwynt' in the Welsh version and that criterion 2 &amp; 3 contain reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF35, NF36</b>  <b>Minor Change NB5, NB6, NB7</b></p>
686,  700	Mr RONALD BOYLE [2672],  Linda Boyle	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1. What will be the justification for 'trigger' mechanisms to determine cumulative impact? Who decides?</p> <p>2. The negative visual impact of one wind turbine in an area where none</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Consideration regarding the impact of a proposal will be based upon a professional judgement over the evidence submitted as part of any application. Since all wind turbine applications are different it is not believed possible to have a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[3071]			<p>previously existed could be considered as a 100% deterioration - how/who will determine the level of impact?</p> <p>3. The downgrading of turbine heights, so that 50m is now considered small is a serious weakening of previous guidance, as is the reduction in visual amenity assessment distances.</p> <p>4. 8000 signatories on Anglesey, expressed the wish of a minimum of 1.5km separation distance with large wind turbines and residences, none is given.</p> <p>5. Trigger factors to determine visual, amenity cumulative impact etc. must be made transparent.</p> <p>6. There must be a separation distance and any permitted should carry a bond to enable decommissioning.</p>	<p>trigger mechanism rather they should be dealt with on an application by application basis.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Criterion (vii) within policy ADN 1 refers to an appropriate land restoration and aftercare scheme that all applications should conform to.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
707	Susan Talbot [3075]	POLICY ADN1	Object	1. The plan classifies 50 metres high wind turbines as 'small-scale', over six times the height of an average house!	<b>Not Accepted</b> – The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>2. Most of the turbines in the existing wind farms in the north of the island are now 'small', so the island's entire interior will be transformed by developments of this scale if the plan proceeds.</p> <p>3. 8000 signatories on Anglesey expressed the wish of a minimum of 1.5km separation distance with large wind turbines and residents. None is given.</p>	<p>about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
64	Mr M Saxton [2647]	7.2.32	Object	<p>50 metres high cannot possibly be described as small scale, I. E. 3 x50 metre turbines, each as high as a 12 or 13 storey tower block of flats is actually ENORMOUS, not small. There seems to be no consideration given to the adverse health effects of this useless form of energy. We expect our local council to respect and preserve the well being of its constituents, so, much greater separation distances have to be legislated for</p> <p>No large 50 metre turbines to be described as small ones.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				Much greater separation distances to assist in the health and well being of anyone unfortunate to reside within a couple of miles of any wind turbine	<p>commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
85	Institute of Biology (Ms Elspeth Wagstaff)	7.2.33	Object	The definitions of types of wind turbines have been changed drastically from that published by IoACC in the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The effect is to put huge wind turbines into	<b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[1496]			<p>the Medium category when previously they would have been regarded as Large.</p> <p>Numbers of turbines in each category are not required as it implies that such quantities will be acceptable when even one turbine is an eyesore.</p> <p>Please reinstate the following wind turbine definitions as from your own document:  Microgeneration: 10 - 18 metres  Small: 12 - 25 metres  Medium: 15 - 50 metres  Large: over 50 metres</p> <p>Delete numbers of turbines from the table.</p>	<p>document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
91	Mr Jon Cottrell [2734]	7.2.33	Object	<p>The adopted Anglesey SPG stated that Medium turbines were 15 - 50 M total height the proposed JDP has re-designated this as Small.</p> <p>The adopted SPG stated that Large turbines started at 50+ M total height the proposed JDP has re-designated this to start at 110 M - twice the height adopted in the SPG!</p> <p>Keep to the agreed SPG and listen to the 8000 residents of Anglesey who signed the partition in 2012.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
178,  195	Rod Dixon [2774],  Mrs Irene	7.2.33	Object	The agreed Onshore Wind Energy SPGs of both Councils state that the maximum tip height for the designated sizes of turbines will be: micro - 11m; small - 20m; medium - 65m; large - 135m.	<b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	Stott [2780]			<p>The councils were assured that these would be carried forward to the LDP, they have not been and the new categories are much increased over the originals.</p> <p>Revert to original agreed size bands as agreed in SPGs.i.e micro - 11m; small - 20m; medium - 65m; large - 135m.</p>	<p>paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
569	Mr John E. Williams [3013]	7.2.33	Object	<p>Definition of scale seems to have been drawn by the Energy Companies. Turbines larger than domestic or micro would transgress the criteria. The emotive use of the word 'industrial' is avoided. Any turbine larger than 'micro' must be 'industrial' so the word should be re-instated. No mention of impact on tourism.</p> <p>Changes: Re-draft table 13 to reflect</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				terminology which describes the turbines in relation to the topography of Anglesey. Reinstate the word 'industrial' to describe the function of turbines larger than micro. Include statement that any 'industrial' turbine development would not be considered as favourable to tourism.	<p>size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
573	Angela Williams [3016]	7.2.33	Object	Any wind turbine that is not domestic, should be properly described as 'industrialised', so that its true purpose be evident. Object to the redefining of medium-sized units as 'small' for the reasons I have outlined, and the use of the word 'micro' to describe a >65 ft	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>structure.</p> <p>Changes: reinstate correct and helpful terminology, to distinguish domestic units and industrialised commercial units. Amend table 13 to reflect realistic size description.</p>	<p>considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1066	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.2.33	Object	<p>Table 13 - Two of the supplementary criteria are very similar 'large/ very large', clarity required on the difference between these two.</p>	<p><b>Accept</b> – Agree that the criterion in relation to 10 or more wind turbines in the typology for Large and Very Large is confusing. To ensure that there is a clear difference the reference to number of turbines should be taken out of the Very Large typology.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That the reference to the number of turbines as criteria be taken out of the Very large typology.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF36</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1069	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.2.34	Object	While the Welsh Government supports the principle of securing sustainable community benefits for communities through voluntary arrangements, they must not impact on the decision making process and should not be treated as a material consideration unless it meets the tests set out in Circular 13/97.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – The purpose of this paragraph is to highlight the principle of obtaining community benefit with wind turbine developments rather than introduce it as a material planning consideration.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
92	Mr Jon Cottrell [2734]	7.2.37	Object	<p>The published Separation distances published in the Anglesey SPG are being totally ignored and were more appropriate to Anglesey than these proposals</p> <p>Keep to the agreed SPG and listen to the 8000 residents of Anglesey who signed the petition in 2012.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
575	Angela Williams [3016]	7.2.37	Object	<p>The fact that Anglesey and Gwynedd are unlike topographically (as well as in terms of areas of protection) must be borne in mind.</p> <p>Change: Inclusion of a minimum distance between turbines/residential properties to prevent a free-for all situations on Anglesey.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
179	Rod Dixon [2774]	7.2.38	Object	<p>The separation distance is arbitrary and no better than the agreed distances in the existing SPGs which were supposed to be transferred to the LDP.</p> <p>Use the separation distances as agreed in the Anglesey SPG</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
196	Mrs Irene Stott [2780]	7.2.38	Object	<p>The separation distance is arbitrary and no better than the agreed distances in the existing SPGs which were supposed to be transferred to the LDP and should be used.</p> <p>Use the separation distances as agreed</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				in the Anglesey SPG	<p>robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
571	Angela Williams [3016]	7.2.38	Object	<p>The Gillespie Report is flawed by reliance on mathematical exactitude, rather than regarding the consideration of amenity as being people-based. Responses to the SPG of 2012/13 not considered.</p> <p>Changes: i) Take consideration of the provisions of the SPG ii) separation distances in the Gillespie Report must be disregarded due to limitations of their research.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**ADN2 – Other Renewable Energy Technologies**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
182,	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY ADN2	Object	Consider this policy is repetitive of national policy e.g. (not all landscapes are of the same value). The policy is too restrictive and not positive toward renewable energy technologies on existing mineral extractions sites or toward previously used land	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – there are very special environmental assets in the area, which have been recognised and designated on a national and international level. Therefore, the area attracts a vast number of tourists / visitors, who make an important contribution to the local economy.</p> <p>Whilst Renewable Energy policies promote renewable technology or low carbon initiatives, it's important that such developments don't compromise the area's biodiversity or landscape designation objectives.</p>
183	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			Remove reference to development boundaries. Reference to temporary use of renewable energy sources on existing mineral extraction sites and positive emphasis toward renewable energy sources on previously used land	<p>Policy ADN1 'On-shore Wind Energy' refers to medium-scale wind farms/turbines (5MW to 25MW) on urban brownfield/industrial sites which could include mineral excavation sites. For any other type of renewable energy, policy ADN2 may support large-scale proposals in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>exceptional circumstances, where an overriding need for the scheme can be justified.</p> <p>Whilst the policy is more supportive of developments within development boundaries, it does not seek to keep developments within such boundaries. Rather, the policy outlines the need for appropriate evidence to justify settings outside the development boundary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
656	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY ADN2	Object	<p>A separate explicit policy is needed for solar energy proposals which should prioritise use of commercial and farm building roofs, presume in favour of micro-solar field arrays in suitable sites and allow larger scale arrays in rural areas only outside the AONB and SLA and only in exceptional circumstances where the site has good natural screening and is not overlooked from nearby higher ground.</p> <p>Change: Add explicit policy covering field solar arrays.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Unit does not believe that there should be a separate policy for solar energy.</p> <p>The current criteria within the policy, together with national policies regarding the AONB and the Plan’s policy for the SLA (AMG1) means that any impact as a result of a solar proposal application would be carefully considered.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
878	Mr John Tripp [252]	POLICY ADN2	Object	Carbon management not emphasised enough. Aim for zero emissions.	<b>Not accepted</b> – Policy PCYFF 4 within the Plan is in relation to Carbon Management. This

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				Example - Wiltshire.	<p>policy is subject to change in relation to additional text over the need for an energy assessment to support applications.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
879	Mr John Tripp [252]	POLICY ADN2	Object	Solar panels - in mega scale, leave space between them for green life beneath, sheep grazing.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Policy PCYFF1 refers to protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>The design and setting of the proposal and the opportunity to use the land underneath the panels as grazing land will be considered with any individual application.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
944	AONB Joint Advisory Committee (Cyngorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY ADN2	Object	Other Renewable Energy Technology. It is believed that this policy is too indefinite in terms of proposals outside development boundaries, and that it should be strengthened.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – it is believed that the policy in its existing form strikes a balance by promoting developments within the development boundary whilst supporting other suitable developments where there is appropriate justification for these outside the development boundary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1059	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY ADN2	Object	<p>Policy ADN2 seeks to constrain non-renewable energy technologies to within development boundaries. This is overly restrictive and contrary to national planning policy. The energy assessment should provide the evidence to plan positively for all forms of renewable and low energy development.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – It is believed that the objector has misinterpreted the policy. Whilst the policy is more supportive of developments within development boundaries, it does not seek to keep developments within such boundaries. Rather, the policy outlines the need for appropriate evidence to justify settings outside the development boundary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					No Change
93	Mr Jon Cottrell [2734]	7.2.45	Support	Solar PV is far more acceptable than wind energy because the shear height of the turbines will totally dominate the landscape for miles around and have a negative impact on tourism.	<p><b>Note the supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

#### ARNA1 – Coastal Change Management Area

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
760	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	POLICY ARNA1	Support	Policy ARNA1 Coastal Change Management is supported.	<p><b>Supportive comment is noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
762	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	<p>Policy ARNA1 is endorsed in principle. A policy that seeks to address shoreline management issues and objectives should fully reflect the outcomes of early engagement with landowners and also, ensure sufficient flexibility to allow for coastal landowners and business operators to relocate buildings and other facilities to open space within existing sites, or to land immediately adjoining their landholdings, where necessary due to coastal erosion. It should refer expressly to allowing landowners and business operators to contribute to funding for, and to retain coastal defence, in accordance with national policy for contributing to funding, as well as providing and maintaining defences.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b>– criterion 7 of Policy ARNA1 facilitates proposals to redevelop or extend property or intensify uses on current sites that are within coastal change management areas, subject to evidence regarding risks to people and property. Policy TWR3 facilitates proposals to relocate current static caravan or chalet sites that are in coastal change management areas.</p> <p>The Policy refers to new defences or replacing previous ones. In this respect, it is believed this clause is sufficient without having to add a reference to who will fund the work.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No sufficiently robust evidence was received to justify revising the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
771	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel	POLICY ARNA1	Object	<p>Criterion 8 significance of .(outside the indicative policy epoch up to 2025) ? Clarify under what circumstances these non-residential developments (beach huts, shops, camp sites, etc.) will be permitted. We have</p>	<p><b>Partly accepted</b> – It is agreed the wording of criterion 8 is unclear. It refers to new non-residential developments on sites within an area where the adopted Shoreline Management Plan states there is to be 'no active intervention' or 'managed</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
	Davey) [1169]			<p>been unable to locate online the CCMA maps. The maps in the Shoreline Management Plan show the location of coastal sections, but not the width of the affected management areas extending back from the coast. Criterion 3- Either cleared or made safe. (rather than .and.)</p>	<p>realignment' or both until 2025 and during 2026 - 2055. The second policy period was selected to reflect the possibility a development application could be submitted before the end of the life of the Plan, meaning starting on it during the final year of the Plan's life.</p> <p>Only the Shoreline Management Plan maps are available are present. It is intended to look into the ability to provide an appropriate level of information in the Plan's Limitations Map for the adoption stage.</p> <p>It is agreed that 'a' should be included at the end of criterion 3.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Revise criterion 3 by adding 'a' to the end of it. Revising criterion 8 to clarify it. Revising paragraph 7.2.49 to explain that the policy is relevant to the first two policy periods of the Shoreline Management Plan, namely up to 2025 and from 2026 to 2055.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF37, NF38</b></p> <p>In order to improve the clarity of the Plan</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
864	Haulfryn Group Ltd [2986]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	Paragraph 8(i) refers to camping sites but does not refer to holiday caravan sites. Where holiday caravan sites are located in CChMA it appears that the existing wording does not allow holiday caravan sites, but only camping sites. The wording should be amended to include holiday caravan sites.	<p><b>Accept</b> – it was not intended in 8(i) to provide an exhaustive list of the kinds of non-residential developments directly linked with the coast that could be acceptable on a site within an area forecast to be at risk during 2026 - 2055. Even so, it is agreed that adding a reference to holiday caravan sites would improve understanding of the policy. Applications for this kind of development would be subject to a number of other policies in the Plan, e.g. Policy TWR3 or Policy TWR4.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Revise the wording of criterion 8(i) to refer to holiday caravan sites.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF38</b></p> <p>To ensure the clarity of the Plan.</p>
865	Haulfryn Group Ltd [2986]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	Where holiday parks are located within the coastal change management area (within the AONB) and relocation of pitches is required due to roll back position from the shoreline, a minor increase in the number of pitches should be	<p><b>Accepted</b> – see the response to objections to TWR3</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – revise Policy TWR3 to refer to a small increase in the number of plots, subject to evidence of the proposal's viability.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
				allowed to assist with funding the re-location of holiday pitches.	<b>Focussed change NF54</b>  In order to ensure the Plan is consistent internally.
872	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	We wish the policy to make it clear that ARNA1 relies strictly on the CURRENT definition of the "West of Wales Shoreline Management Plan 2". We note that in the WWSMP that Borth y Gest is clearly marked as "hold the Line" and benefits from this policy until at least 2055. We consider that the policy should make clear that after the local plan is adopted, any subsequent change to the WWSMP2 will not change the areas to which ARNA1 would apply.	<b>Not accepted-</b> after the Plan is adopted an Annual Monitoring Report will be published. That report will record progress against a series of indicators in the monitoring framework. It will also record significant changes in local, regional or national circumstances that are relevant to the Plan's strategies and policies. If there were any significant change in the Coastline Management Plan, then Policy ARNA1 would need to be reviewed. It would be necessary to consult on any changes in policy due to the monitoring or review work.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No sufficiently robust evidence was received to justify revising the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
940	Cyng/Counc Alwyn	POLICY ARNA1	Object	The plan needs to be more coordinated. It is not rational to note an area as one which is at risk of flooding on one hand, while on the other noting	<b>Not accepted-</b> The Plan does not have housing designations within settlement boundaries inside the Coastal Change Management Area. Policy ARNA1

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
	Gruffydd [381]			the numbers of houses which the area requires. That the West Wales Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) 2 needs to be considered and the plan should be aligned with it.	<p>does not support new housing within the Coastal Change Management Area, e.g. Fairbourne. The requirements of Policy PS5, Policy PS6 and Policy PCYFF1, as well as Planning Policy Wales and NCT 15 would be relevant to proposals for new housing in flood risk areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No sufficiently robust evidence was received to justify revising the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1070	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	The Policy is supported in principle but would benefit from minor editing to ensure clarity. Clause 1 - suggest insertion of "predicted to be" immediately before "threatened", to ensure link to SMP. Clause 2 - clarify whether proposals must meet both sub-clauses (i) and (ii), or either one of the sub-clauses. Clause 6 - it is not clear why the requirement for NRW consent is specific and unique to this clause. Clause 8 - The text within brackets is unclear, as it appears to suggest that after the first policy epoch (2025) certain	<p><b>Accept</b> – It is agreed the Policy would be clearer if minor changes were made.</p> <p>It is agreed the Policy needs to be made consistent with the Shoreline Management Plan by referring to the possibility of being under threat. It is agreed it should be made clearer whether all the criteria are relevant and there is no detailed reference to the requirements of NRW. Editing the policy by referring to non-residential developments as a whole would make the policy more readable. It is believed there is a need to differentiate between areas where short</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
				developments would be acceptable. It is not clear how that fits with a plan with an end date of 2026.	<p>term risk is forecast and areas where medium term risk is forecast.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Revise the Policy by means of minor editing in accordance with the above comments.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF38, NF39</b></p>
1138	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	Rather than seek for specific amendments to policy ARNA1 which seek to exclude application of this policy from the marine located associated development, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which would be the relevant policies against which to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion to its associated development from these policies.	<p><b>Not accepted-</b> see the response to other objections in terms of the suitability of the content of the new policies suggested by the objector. If the site of a development proposed by the objector were within an area identified in the Shoreline Management Plan as under threat during the life of the Plan, the proposal would then be assessed against the requirements of Policy ARNA1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No sufficiently robust evidence was received to justify revising the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>





## CHAPTER 7.3 ECONOMY AND REGENERATION

### Major Infrastructure Projects

#### Context and Introduction

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
866	National Grid (Mrs Rebecca Evans) [2961]	7.3.1	Object	National Grid would expect to see reference to National Policy Statements (NPSs) within the JLDP's policy background on large infrastructure projects, for example paragraphs 7.3.1 to 7.3.17 could contain further information on the role of the NPSs, which is mentioned briefly at the start of Strategic Policy PS8.	<p><b>Agree</b> – Further information will be included within the background text to emphasise the role of the NSP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To demonstrate that appropriate regard is made to National Policy and Guidance further information will be included relating to the role of National Policy Statements.</p> <p><b>Focussed change: NF40, NF41, NF42, NF45</b></p>
1139 1156 1140 1141 1142 1143 1144 1145 1146 1147 1148 1149 1150 1151 1152	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	7.3.1 7.3.2 7.3.3 7.3.4 7.3.5 7.3.6 7.3.7 7.3.9 7.3.10 7.3.11 7.3.12 7.3.13 7.3.14 7.3.15 7.3.16	Object	The clarity of these paragraphs could be improved, particularly what is meant by the distinction between "major infrastructure projects" and nationally significant infrastructure projects as defined by the Planning Act 2008. The chapter varies between being written for general application to "major infrastructure projects"; and being written specifically about the Wylfa Newydd Project. Some explanatory text and policy includes clauses drafted exclusively for deposit version of the Plan and others include clauses for pre-adoption, application and post-construction. This needs to be reviewed and standardised to avoid confusion in interpretation. Additionally, minor errors in the description of the NSIP regime and description of "associated developments"	<p><b>Partly Agree</b> – It is believed that an adequate emphasis is placed on Wylfa Newydd plans and the economic advantages that would derive from it in the plan.</p> <p>It is however considered that this section of the Plan could be restructured so as to differentiate between Wylfa Newydd and other National Significant Infrastructure Projects also it is agreed that consistency is required in terms of the terminology used within the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure the internal consistency of the Plan and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1153		7.3.17			clarity the policy will be reworded and restructures (PS8 and PS). The terminology used will also be amended accordingly.  <b>Focussed change: NF40, NF41, NF42, NF45</b>
867	National Grid (Mrs Rebecca Evans) [2961]	7.3.13	Object	National Grid has some concerns about the description of planning contributions, particularly community benefits, within paragraphs 7.3.13 to 7.3.17. National Grid will always seek to reduce the negative impacts of its proposed developments through carefully considered design iterations informed by assessments and consultation; through the identification of comprehensive mitigation measures. It is recognised that in some cases planning conditions may not adequately secure the inherent design and further mitigation measures and these may therefore need to be secured in planning terms through a Section 106 agreement. In the case of Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, EN-1 sets out when planning obligations may be used for energy infrastructure, and indicates that weight can only be given to obligations which meet all of the tests for their use. Amend criterion 4 of PS8 and delete criterion 5.	<b>Not accepted</b> – Although voluntary community benefits may not apply to the National Grid it is relevant for other National Significant Infrastructure projects and therefore the criterion shouldn't be removed.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

#### PS8 – Proposals for Large Infrastructure Projects

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
466	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS8	Support	Bourne Leisure considers that the existing stock of holiday accommodation, including that provided at Greenacres and Hafan-y-Mor may be able to assist in meeting the housing requirement for the 8,500 construction workers that will be on site at peak construction periods. The Deposit Plan states that the workforce will be accommodated via various means including existing	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				holiday accommodation and purpose built holiday accommodation built by Horizon.	
843	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mr Arwel Evans) [2767]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS8	Support	Bourne Leisure considers that the existing stock of holiday accommodation, including that provided at Greenacres and Hafan-y-Mor may be able to assist in meeting the housing requirement for the 8,500 construction workers that will be on site at peak construction periods. The Deposit Plan states that the workforce will be accommodated via various means including existing holiday accommodation and purpose built holiday accommodation built by Horizon.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1154	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS8	Object	Horizon's representations seek to clarify that it is PS9 which applies to the Wylfa Newydd Project rather than a mix of PS8 and PS9. Having excluded PS 8 from the policy framework for the Wylfa Newydd Project Horizon does not therefore comment specifically on PS8 except to note that any changes made to PS9 (in accordance with its representations below) may be usefully carried through to PS8 for consistency.	<p><b>Partly Agree</b> – It is considered necessary to restructure this section of the Plan so that there is greater clarity between the sections which refer to Wylfa Newydd and those which specifically refer to National Significant Infrastructure Projects.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure the internal consistency of the Plan the policy will be reworded and restructured (PS8 and PS9).</p> <p><b>Focussed change: NF41</b></p>

### PS9 – Wylfa Newydd Related Development

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
464	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS9	Support	Bourne Leisure considers that the existing stock of holiday accommodation, including that provided at Greenacres and Hafan-y-Mor may be able to assist in meeting the housing requirement for the 8,500 construction workers	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				that will be on site at peak construction periods. The Deposit Plan states that the workforce will be accommodated via various means including existing holiday accommodation and purpose built holiday accommodation built by Horizon.	<b>No Change</b>
844	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mr Arwel Evans) [2767]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS9	Support	Bourne Leisure considers that the existing stock of holiday accommodation, including that provided at Greenacres and Hafan-y-Mor may be able to assist in meeting the housing requirement for the 8,500 construction workers that will be on site at peak construction periods. The Deposit Plan states that the workforce will be accommodated via various means including existing holiday accommodation and purpose built holiday accommodation built by Horizon.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
862	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS9	Object	A 'plan B' is needed in case this project, which is years away from final approval, does not go ahead.	<b>Not accepted</b> – The policy relates specifically to the development of Wylfa Newydd. If Wylfa Newydd doesn't proceed then the policy won't be applied.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
882	Mr John Tripp [252]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS9	Object	The contractors of Wylfa B to employ 85% + - local people. Need to secure a big training school.	<b>Not accepted</b> – Current investment is underway to provide adequate training facilities for the training and operational workers. There are relevant Policies within the Plan which will be applied when considering training facilities.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
930	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS9	Support	Some of our assets may require investment to facilitate growth related to Wylfa Newydd. Our AMP investment is regulated both in terms of the amount of funding and the timing of the planned work therefore there may be instances where developers needs do not coincide with the timing of our investment. Where infrastructure improvements would be required prior to planned investment we would look at other mechanisms to fill this funding gap such as developers' contributions through planning obligations. Once the locations of associated development are confirmed we will assess the impact upon our assets and advise accordingly.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1155	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS9	Object	In order to ensure that the unique opportunity to transform the economy and communities of Anglesey is recognised by the Plan specific Wylfa Newydd Project policies should be developed that along with PS9 should shape the approach to the Wylfa Newydd Project and in particular the proposals for associated development. Recognising the unique status of the development whilst the other policies in the Plan should be properly considered the PS9 and proposed Wylfa Newydd specific policies should take precedence where there is an inconsistency or conflict between them and the other policies. Specific amendments are suggested to criteria 3, 7, 9, 11 & 12.	<b>Not accepted</b> –It is believed that an adequate emphasis is placed on Wylfa Newydd plans and the economic advantages that would derive from it in the plan. There are other policies within the Plan which include planning principles, that would need to be referred to when responding to applications associated with Wylfa Newydd  Further work will be undertaken to ensure consistency between the Plan and the Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to Wylfa Newydd, which is likely to result in a review of the current version of the SPG.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

### Providing Opportunities for a Flourishing Economy

#### PS10 – Providing Opportunity for a Flourishing Economy

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
455	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	Specific reference should be added to PS10 to reflect the important role that tourism plays in ensuring a flourishing economy. A 4th bullet point should be added to read:  "4. Supporting new and existing tourism development/redevelopment where appropriate, in order to take full advantage of the economic benefit that tourism development brings to the Local Plan area."	<b>Do not accept</b> – It is considered that other sections of the Plan adequately deal with the economic benefits deriving from tourism initiatives.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
803	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	Based on the allocated 807 ha of employment land and premises within the Deposit LDP there is over 66 years of employment land and premises supply within the Plan area. Whilst it is recognised that Wylfa Newydd could have a significant economic impact on the need and demand for employment land and premises, there will not be the need for this level of employment land or premises. The Plan therefore significantly over allocates and protects employment land premises and particularly sites which are unlikely to deliver employment due to the sites not meeting the needs of industry, or subject to significant site	<b>Accept</b> - It is accepted that further explanation is required of the need to protect/allocate 807 ha of employment land. It is believed that the fact that the policy protects as well as allocates employment sites creates confusion.  The deposit version of the Plan also allocated new employment land, i.e. green field sites with no infrastructure. Those have also been included in the list in Policy CYF1. PS10, therefore, identifies sites to meet existing and future employment needs. The provision has been dispersed across the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>constraints.</p> <p>The Policy therefore does not comply with Test of Soundness C2 as it does not comply with Planning Policy Wales &amp; CE2 as it is not realistic having regard to other alternatives or based upon credible evidence.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to only include sufficient available, suitable and deliverable employment land needed for the duration of the Plan Period.</p>	<p>Plan area and offers choice in terms of location and size. The provision of employment land provides an element of flexibility in terms of the choice available.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>In order to improve clarity, it is proposed that the Strategic Policy is amended to include a further explanation regarding how the figure for employment land has been determined. It is proposed that the policy is amended in order to differentiate between the land allocated and what is being safeguarded.</p> <p><b>Focussed change: NF46</b></p>
825	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	PS10 Comment on conclusion of needs for employment land from alternative studies.	<p><b>Partially accept</b> – In response to comments from other objectors it is proposed to amend the policy to include further information regarding the conclusions of the Employment Land Survey.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity, it is proposed to amend the Plan in order to include further explanation regarding the protected employment land.</p> <p><b>Focussed change: NF46</b></p>
828	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	We are glad that Llanystumdwy Agri Park has been included as Secondary Site but we consider that other sites should be considered, e.g. the old Laundry at Afonwen.	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – It is acknowledged that small rural businesses have an important role to play within the local economy and it is believed that Policy CYF5 of the Plan adequately deals with this matter.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				We consider that more should be done to retain industrial sites when they change hands and that the Plan does not do enough to support small businesses, particularly family businesses in the countryside.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
902	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	<p>PS10 is inconsistent with the remainder of the LDP as it doesn't recognise the significant economic benefit that tourism brings to the local area. Paragraph 4.3 states that tourists/visitors make an important contribution to the local economy. Bourne Leisure therefore maintains that PS10 should reflect the significant contribution that tourism makes to the local economy.</p> <p>Recognition of the important role of tourism within Strategic Policy PS10 is also necessary to ensure consistency with PPW (para 11.1.1). It would also accord with the Gwynedd Destination Management Plan (2013 - 2020).</p> <p>Bourne Leisure therefore comments that specific reference should be added to PS10 to reflect the important role that tourism plays in ensuring a flourishing economy.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – It is considered that other sections of the Plan adequately deal with the economic benefits deriving from tourism initiatives.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1046	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	<p>Welsh Government supports economic growth however, it is crucial that this economic growth meet the authorities' objectives. The authorities should clarify that oversupplying the market to this extent (approximately by 300ha) will not have negative implications for land values; nor hinder development from coming forward or jeopardise growth aspirations.</p>	<p><b>Accept</b> - It is accepted that further explanation is required of the need to protect/allocate 807 ha of employment land. It is believed that the fact that the policy protects as well as allocates employment sites creates confusion.</p> <p>The deposit version of the Plan also allocated new employment land, i.e. green field sites with no infrastructure. Those have also been included in the list in Policy CYF1. PS10, therefore, identifies</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>sites to meet existing and future employment needs. The provision has been dispersed across the Plan area and offers choice in terms of location and size. The provision of employment land provides an element of flexibility in terms of the choice available.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>In order to improve clarity, it is proposed that the Strategic Policy is amended so as to include a further explanation regarding how the figure for employment land has been determined. It is proposed that the policy is amended in order to differentiate between the land allocated and what is being safeguarded.</p> <p><b>Focussed change: NF45, NF46, NF47</b></p>
1166	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	<p>Concerns about the lack of flexibility in relation to non-employment related development (B1, B2 and B8) on sites covered by the policy, particularly in relation to a change of use for legacy (e.g. to tourism) as this would reduce the overall availability of B1, B2 and B8 sites and therefore run counter to the intention for these to be employment sites. However, rather than seek for specific amendments to policies PS10, CYF1 and CYF2 however, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies which will be the relevant policies against which to determine its associated development applications.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> - It is acknowledged that it is possible that employment sites could remain unoccupied for a period of time without investment, and therefore, there are possibly grounds to permit alternative use (to employment) on some sites. It is noted, however, that the Employment Land Survey has noted the need to protect and allocate the sites in question (in policy CYF1) for employment use (Use Class B1, B2 or B8 mainly), following an assessment of needs and their real ability to come forward for the use in question. Therefore, the starting-point for employment use is the use favoured on those employment sites identified in Policy CYF1.</p> <p>There is an existing policy, Policy CYF4, which</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>provides an element of flexibility on employment sites for alternative uses in exceptional circumstances only, where strong evidence is available to justify doing so. It is in keeping with Planning Policy Wales and TAN23. Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan identifies a series of supplementary planning guidance which will be prepared to support the Plan. It identifies an intention to prepare one which will provide guidance regarding the evidence required relating to alternative developments.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1301	Cyngor Dinas Bangor (Mr Gwyn Hughes) [1523]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	<p>The City Council is of the opinion that existing sites in Bangor accommodating such enterprises should be protected from redevelopment. Examples would be the small units at the rear of the upper part of the High Street and Station Road and the site between Sackville Road and Mentec.</p> <p>More sites should be allocated for such uses in the JLDP so that small business start-ups would be encouraged in the interest of nurturing enterprise in the local economy.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – An Employment Land Survey has been carried out, which has sought to identify the need for employment sites – that need has been reflected in the Plan. Therefore, it is not believed that it would be considerate to allocate more land for employment use.</p> <p>The Plan in its current form permits creating new industrial units where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1412	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	<p>NFU Wales would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. We are eager to ensure opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expansion of existing businesses;</li> <li>• Re-use of existing rural buildings appropriate for employment opportunities;</li> <li>• Provide work units by adapting traditional rural buildings;</li> <li>• Diversification of the agricultural economy;</li> <li>• Support social and economic regeneration in rural areas;</li> <li>• Adapting and changing the use of redundant rural buildings outside development boundaries should be permitted to create employment use;</li> <li>• Viable scheme that can adapt to current farming and business demands so that they can prosper in the countryside.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – An Employment Land Survey has been carried out, which has sought to identify the need for employment sites – that need has been reflected in the Plan. Therefore, it is not believed that it would be considerate to allocate more land for employment use.</p> <p>The Plan in its current form permits creating new industrial units where appropriate, in order to support rural economy and convert rural buildings.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1418	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	<p>NFU Wales would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. We are eager to seek opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initiatives required to satisfy the needs of contemporary farming and forestry. Also infrastructure including green energy, tourism and other initiatives</li> </ul>	<p><b>Do not accept</b></p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				that would support a sustainable rural economy.	<b>No Change</b>
1424	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Object	<p>NFU Wales would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. The Plan should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make the most effective use of land in the area and there needs to be a specific reference in the Plan to the value of agriculture and local produce.</li> <li>• Promote not farming growth and diversification</li> <li>• Acknowledge the value of small holdings in Anglesey and Gwynedd as a way that young farmers can start and develop businesses.</li> <li>• Acknowledge the value of agriculture and local food businesses to the local economy, employment opportunities and the Welsh language.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Do not accept</b></p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>
1608	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Support	Water mains required for any potential development can be acquired through the water requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (am amended). Any proposed site which requires the provision of non-potable water for process use will need further examination to understand how this requirement could be delivered. Sewerage required for any potential development site can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).	<p><b>Note the supporting comment.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1609	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Support	* Should potential end users of these sites result in the discharge of new or amended trade effluent then the written consent of DCWW is required.	<p><b>Note the supporting comment.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1610	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	STRATEGIC POLICY PS10	Support	* The proposed employment allocations represent a substantial area of land for development for which the potential demands are unknown at present. It is essential	<b>Note the supporting comment.</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			that we understand these demands in order to allow us to assess the impact on our assets. It may be necessary for water and sewerage modelling assessments to be undertaken to establish how we would provide the water supply and where the proposed development could connect to the public sewerage system. At this moment in time, our response is on the basis of domestic demands based on the area and location of the proposed allocations.	<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### CYF1 – Safeguarding and Allocating Land and Units for Employment Use

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
801	Menter Iaith Bangor (Mrs Branwen Thomas) [2762]	POLICY CYF1	Support	Fair employment is crucial to provide a basis for a stable community in Bangor - ensuring the success of the Welsh language. Welcoming the scheme that proposes to safeguard land and units on the existing employment sites in Bangor. There is a great need for a further development.  Recommend establishing a committee to examine the 21st century needs of the city of Bangor as one entity. There is a need to secure dwellings, infrastructure, employment and education opportunities, a shopping centre, a clean environment and appropriate amenities for the residents and all users of the city. There is a need for the Committee to include representation of friends of the city.	<b>Note the supporting comment.</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
826	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel	POLICY CYF1	Object	CYF1 Comment on difference between safeguarded amount and target take-up rate of employment land.	<b>Accept</b> – It is agreed that there is a need to amend the Policy in order to gain more clarity regarding how the figure for the land to be protected and allocated has been determined.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Davey) [1169]				<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>For clarity, it is proposed that the Policy is amended to differentiate between employment land allocation and protection, together with further clarity regarding how the lands have been identified.</p> <p><b>Focussed change – NF47</b></p>
883	Mr John Tripp [252]	POLICY CYF1	Object	<p>Aim for Holyhead to develop industry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* explore Wylfa B</li> <li>* main port from Ireland</li> </ul>	<p><b>Do not accept</b></p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1013	Cyngor Cymuned Pentir (Mr Dilwyn Pritchard) [1536]	POLICY CYF1	Object	<p>The Council is concerned that an industrial site is proposed in the Penrhosgarnedd area. The Council doesn't object to creating more employment sites, but it was considered that this would add to the area's hustle and bustle. It must be remembered that a lot of money has been spent during the last decade to develop Bryn Cegin Estate and the reasonable steps would be to get this site operational. It could also house the new science park being proposed for Gaerwen, Anglesey.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b></p> <p>Comment noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1047	Welsh Government (Mr Mark	POLICY CYF1	Object	<p>Further clarification is required on how the distribution of employment sites relate to the provision for housing. The housing commitments/ allocations are based on a</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – It is agreed that it is appropriate to amend the table which includes the employment land allocations in order to highlight how it</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Newey) [1561]			hierarchy of settlements and it would be helpful if the employment sites could be presented in a similar manner. It would also be helpful if further information could be provided on how the authorities have considered the inter-linkages between the three main strategic employment sites along the A55 corridor, and that these are not in competition with each other and therefore creating problems of deliverability.	addresses the classification strategy.  The growth level in the Plan is based on a high economy in order to address the Plan's vision and objectives. It is a scenario which conveys the Councils' aspirations to maximise job increases within the local economy, especially in the last section of the Plan. The housing growth level reflects this. It is believed that this aspect makes the growth projections for the lifetime of the Plan more powerful than the projections based on trends, which do not reflect the Councils' aspirations (especially IACC) for the area. It is believed that providing a mix and range of high quality employment sites which are able to meet business and employer requirements is fundamental in order to ensure economic success. The significant proposals by the private sector, e.g. Horizon, will attract other employers and add to the skills pool available locally.  <b>Recommendation</b>  For clarity the employment sites table will be amended and split according to the relevant settlement. Further there will be a need to link this section of the Plan with the section which relates to housing growth.  <b>Focused Change: NF45, NF46, NF47, NF48</b>
1048	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey)	POLICY CYF1	Object	Further clarification is required to:  1. explain why the plan makes provision for approximately 478ha compared to a need for approximately 180ha of	<b>Accept</b> – It is agreed that it is appropriate to amend the policy in order to justify how much employment land is being allocated / protected.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[1561]			<p>employment land as set out in the employment land review.</p> <p>2. demonstrate that the implications of this over allocation for housing provision and the deliverability of the sites has been considered.</p> <p>3. demonstrate that the employment assessment is in accordance with Welsh Government's "TAN 23: Economic Development (2014)"</p> <p>4. explain what the implications would be on types of jobs (skills and salaries) and homes if land take were to exceed the 180ha over the plan period and whether the assessment work, especially the WLIA has taken account of this over-allocation.</p>	<p>There is a current Employment Land Study which has been carried out to assess the employment sites in order to select those most likely to meet today's business requirements as well as those in the future, due to their location and accessibility. This is in keeping with the Plan's sustainable objectives, and also provides a level of flexibility to consider alternative proposals (not within use class B1, B2 or B8 but which create jobs) by using specific criteria (Policy CYF4). This is in keeping with Planning Policy Wales (Section 7.5)</p> <p>A number of the protected employment sites in Anglesey are protected and allocated to reflect the Island's status as an Enterprise Zone. Enterprise Zone sites receive support from the Welsh Government.</p> <p>The monitoring framework will review the Plan, and if it is identified that too much employment land is being provided via the Plan, it will be possible to review this.</p> <p>Recently, the Welsh Government has produced a paper which supports Technical Advice Note 23: Economic Development. This paper provides further guidance on the methodology of carrying out an employment study. The recommended methodology corresponds to the methodology used for our Employment Land Study. It is proposed (together with the Economic Development Departments of both Authorities) to maintain a database which will include current information regarding the employment uses that</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>exist on the employment sites in question.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – For clarity, it is proposed to amend the Policy to explain in more detail how the employment figure has been determined.</p> <p><b>Focussed change: NF46, NF47, NF48</b></p>
1167	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY CYF1	Object	<p>Concerns about the lack of flexibility in relation to non-employment related development (B1, B2 and B8) on sites covered by the policy, particularly in relation to a change of use for legacy (e.g. to tourism) as this would reduce the overall availability of B1, B2 and B8 sites and therefore run counter to the intention for these to be employment sites. However, rather than seek for specific amendments to policies PS10, CYF1 and CYF2 however, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies which will be the relevant policies against which to determine its associated development applications.</p>	<p><b>Partly accept</b> - It is acknowledged that it is possible that employment sites could remain unoccupied for a period of time without investment, and therefore there are possibly grounds to permit alternative use (to employment) on some sites. It is noted, however, that the Employment Land Survey has noted the need to protect and allocate the sites in question (in policy CYF1) for employment use (Use Class B1, B2 or B8 mainly), following an assessment of needs and their real ability to come forward for the use in question. Therefore, the starting-point for employment use is the use favoured on those employment sites identified in Policy CYF1.</p> <p>There is an existing policy, Policy CYF4, which provides an element of flexibility on the employment sites for alternative uses in exceptional circumstances only, where strong evidence is available to justify doing so. It is in keeping with Planning Policy Wales and TAN23. Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan identifies a series of supplementary planning guidance which will be prepared to support the Plan. It identifies an intention to prepare one which will provide guidance regarding the evidence required relating</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>to alternative developments.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB10</b></p>
1401	Cyng/Counc Alwyn Gruffydd [381]	POLICY CYF1	Object	The provision of industrial land needs to be extended beyond the main centres to expand growth across the County. This would be a method of safeguarding communities by taking advantage of economic vitality.	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – A survey of Employment Lands has been carried out, which has identified the needs for employment land during the lifetime of the Plan. It is considered that adequate provision has been proposed, which include sites in y Ffôr.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### CYF2 – Ancillary Uses on Employment Sites

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1168	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox)	POLICY CYF2	Object	Concerns about the lack of flexibility in relation to non-employment related development (B1, B2 and B8) on sites covered by the policy, particularly in relation to a change of use for legacy (e.g. to tourism) as this would reduce the	<b>Partly accept</b> - It is acknowledged that it is possible that employment sites could remain unoccupied for a period of time without investment, and therefore there are possibly grounds to permit

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2919]			<p>overall availability of B1, B2 and B8 sites and therefore run counter to the intention for these to be employment sites. However, rather than seek for specific amendments to policies PS10, CYF1 and CYF2 however, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies which will be the relevant policies against which to determine its associated development applications.</p>	<p>alternative use (to employment) on some sites. It is noted, however, that the Employment Land Survey has noted the need to protect and allocate the sites in question (in policy CYF1) for employment use (Use Class B1, B2 or B8 mainly), following an assessment of needs and their real ability to come forward for the use in question. Therefore, the starting-point for employment use is the use favoured on those employment sites identified in Policy CYF1.</p> <p>There is an existing policy, Policy CYF4, which provides an element of flexibility on the employment sites for alternative uses in exceptional circumstances only, where strong evidence is available to justify doing so. It is in keeping with Planning Policy Wales and TAN23. Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan identifies a series of supplementary planning guidance which will be prepared to support the Plan. It identifies an intention to develop one which will provide guidance regarding the evidence required relating to alternative developments. It is not considered that robust information has been submitted which would justify amending the wording of the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					Minor Change: NB10

CYF3 – No comments

CYF4 – Alternative Uses of Employment Sites

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
798	First Investments Ltd [3091]	POLICY CYF4	Object	<p>FIL object to the current wording of this policy which, instead of promoting investment and improvements to existing employment space, will result in, at best, retaining the status quo at Peblig Mill Industrial Estate owned which is characterised by old and, in some cases, defunct employment floorspace with a high proportion of vacancies. The policy should instead promote investment in existing employment stock and where necessary, promote alternative uses on the Peblig site that are capable of delivering investment and improvements to the overall quality of employment floorspace.</p> <p>FIL request that the policy be amended to include the following changes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Create a further independent criterion which deals with poor quality employment sites, e.g. Peblig Industrial Estate, to permit alternative uses and the loss of some employment land where such development could deliver improvements to the remaining floorspace.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Partly accept</b> - It is acknowledged that it is possible that employment sites could remain unoccupied for a period of time without investment, and therefore, there are possibly grounds to permit alternative use (to employment) on some sites. It is noted, however, that the Employment Land Survey has noted the need to protect and allocate the sites in question (in policy CYF1) for employment use (Use Class B1, B2 or B8 mainly), following an assessment of needs and their real ability to come forward for the use in question. Therefore, the starting-point for employment use is the use favoured on those employment sites identified in Policy CYF1.</p> <p>There is an existing policy, Policy CYF4, which provides an element of flexibility on the employment sites for alternative uses in exceptional circumstances only, where strong evidence is available to justify doing so. It is in keeping with Planning Policy Wales and TAN23. Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan identifies a series of supplementary planning guidance which will be prepared to support the Plan. It identifies an intention to develop one which will provide</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>guidance regarding the evidence required relating to alternative developments. It is not considered that robust information has been submitted which would justify amending the wording of the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB10</b></p>
827	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY CYF4	Object	CYF4 More flexibility sought in alternate use of sites.	<p><b>Do not accept</b> - It is acknowledged that it is possible that employment sites could remain unoccupied for a period of time without investment, and therefore there are possibly grounds to permit alternative use (to employment) on some sites. It is noted, however, that the Employment Land Survey has noted the need to protect and allocate the sites in question (in policy CYF1) for employment use (Use Class B1, B2 or B8 mainly), following an assessment of needs and their real ability to come forward for the use in question. Therefore, the starting-point for employment use is the use favoured on those employment sites identified in Policy CYF1.</p> <p>There is an existing policy, Policy CYF4, which provides an element of flexibility on the employment sites for alternative uses in exceptional circumstances only, where strong evidence is available to justify doing so. It is in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>keeping with Planning Policy Wales and TAN23. Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan identifies a series of supplementary planning guidance which will be prepared to support the Plan. It identifies an intention to develop one which will provide guidance regarding the evidence required relating to alternative developments. It is not considered that robust information has been submitted which would justify amending the wording of the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1169	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY CYF4	Object	<p>It is not clear how the criteria of this policy would need to be met in order for land to be released and what evidence will be acceptable to the Councils in proving conformity to the policy. However, rather than seek for specific amendments to policy CYF4, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which will be the relevant policies against which to determine its associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion of its associated development from these policies</p>	<p><b>Partly accept</b> – It is considered that adequate explanation has been included within the Policy. In due course, it is proposed to prepare a Supplementary Planning Guidance to provide further guidance regarding changing the use of Employment Sites.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB10</b></p>

CYF5 – Reuse and Conversion of Rural Buildings, Use of Residential Properties or New Build Units for Business / Industrial Use

[

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
332	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	Policy CYF5	Object	Generally supportive of the policy. However, there are many existing vernacular rural buildings that are not structurally sound but are still largely intact which have heritage value. Under the policy currently drafted these would be lost. These types of building could however be repaired and viable uses reintroduced which would help to preserve the local character and/or the Welsh culture. The policy should reflect this.	<p><b>No Change</b> - It is acknowledged that there are traditional buildings that are an important part of the area’s historic rural built environment. The clause which notes the need for a building to be structurally sound ensures that the development would not lead to creating new units. It’s important for it to be possible to convert buildings without significant structural work, which therefore ensures that important historic characteristics are protected. It is intended to prepare a Supplementary Planning Guidance in due course, which would provide further guidance on what would be considered as a ‘structurally sound’ building. See Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan. It is not considered that robust information has been submitted which would justify amending the wording of the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
884	Mr John Tripp [252]	Policy CYF5	Object	Farming and fishing - important sector, particularly mussels being exported to Holland.	<p><b>No Change</b> – Comment noted</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

#### CYF6 – Regeneration Sites

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
804	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	POLICY CYF6	Object	<p>This policy seeks to promote economic growth and contribute to social and environmental objectives by facilitating urban renewal schemes, including for mixed use purposes for housing, employment, retail and leisure etc. However, the policy does not specify any specific regeneration sites despite the references within the Wales Spatial Plan to the mixed-use development of the former Dynamex Friction site in Caernarfon.</p> <p>Clearly, the former Dynamex Friction Site, given our representations to other policies of the Plan, falls within this policy approach.</p> <p>The former Dynamex Friction site of 20 ha should be identified within this policy for regeneration and redevelopment for mixed use purposes including, employment, housing, and other appropriate uses.</p> <p>This is necessary as the other policies of the Plan will not enable the redevelopment and regeneration of this vacant, contaminated and previously developed site, which is sustainably located in close proximity to Caernarfon.</p>	<p><b>Partly accept</b> – The site in question has been identified as a site which will contribute towards the area's employment requirements. Policy CYF4 permits change of use on employment sites provided the proposals comply with a series of criteria.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB10</b></p>



### 7.3 Omissions

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
1162	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	7:3 Omissions	Object	Horizon has proposed WNP1 which is specifically related to the siting of new non-residential associated development related to the Wylfa Newydd Project.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – There are other policies within the Plan which include the planning policy principles which will be considered when considering applications associated with Wylfa Newydd.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1163	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	7:3 Omissions	Object	Horizon has proposed WNP2 which is specifically related to the large scale temporary worker accommodation associated development related to the Wylfa Newydd Project.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - There are other policies within the Plan which include the planning policy principles which will be considered when considering applications associated with Wylfa Newydd.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1164	Horizon Nuclear Power	7:3	Object	Horizon has proposed WNP3 which is specifically related to the temporary construction workforce for the Wylfa	<b>Not Accepted</b> - There are other policies within the Plan which include the planning policy principles

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
	(Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	Omissions		Newydd Project.	<p>which will be considered when considering applications associated with Wylfa Newydd.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1165	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	7:3 Omissions	Object	Horizon has proposed WNP4 which is specifically related to early works related to the Wylfa Newydd Project.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - There are other policies within the Plan which include the planning policy principles which will be considered when considering applications associated with Wylfa Newydd.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## Employment Sites

### 1) Bangor

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
786	Parc Bryn	POLICY CYF1,	Object	We request the planning status of Parc Bryn Cegin, is	<b>Partially accept</b> - Policy CYF4 promotes alternative

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Cegin Cinema campaign (Mrs Tammy Hales) [2745]	C1 - Parc Bryn Cegin, Bangor		<p>changed from business planning employment, to include leisure planning permission status A1, A3, C1, D2 &amp; D8. Thus creating;</p> <p>1) Local employment,</p> <p>2) Much needed leisure facilities,</p> <p>3) Creating a tourist attraction and</p> <p>4) Boosting the local economy.</p> <p>If the planning status of Parc Bryn Cegin remain unchanged, it is likely the site will remain dormant.</p> <p>To change the planning status of Parc Bryn Cegin from business planning employment, to include or ideally change to leisure planning permission status A1, A3, C1, D2 &amp; D8.</p>	<p>uses on employment sites when justification for this has been accepted. Inevitably, when considering any alternative use, consideration would have to be given to the policies within the plan in its entirety, i.e. the policies that are relevant to the uses in question. It is not believed that robust evidence has been submitted which requires the Plan to be amended.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB10</b></p>
1611	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C1 - Parc Bryn Cegin, Bangor	Object	<p>The employment area represents a substantial area of land for development for which the potential demands are unknown at present. Once demands are known an assessment can be made of the extent of any off-site water mains that may be required. This site is crossed by a 250mm water main along its northern boundary which will restrict development density for the site. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights of access to its apparatus at all times.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1612	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	POLICY CYF1, C1 - Parc Bryn Cegin, Bangor	Object	<p>A sewage pumping station (SPS) is located within the site and an assessment may be required to establish whether the flows from this site can be accommodated or whether</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			future improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed. Should the existing sewerage infrastructure not be sufficient to accommodate the proposed level of growth the provision of sewerage infrastructure can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).	during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1613	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C1 - Parc Bryn Cegin, Bangor	Object	The site would eventually drain to the Bangor Beach Road SPS and an assessment of this SPS may be required to establish whether flows from this site can be accommodated or whether future improvements would be required to the SPS to allow development to proceed. The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1614	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C2 – Llandygai Industrial estate, Bangor	Object	The local water network located within the existing industrial estate is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.  The local sewerage network located within the existing industrial estate can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area.  The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1615	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water	POLICY CYF1, C3 - Parc	Object	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this	<b>Comment Noted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	(Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Britannia, Bangor		<p>development area.</p> <p>The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area.</p> <p>The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1616	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C4 - Parc Menai, Bangor	Object	<p>Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area</p> <p>The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1441	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhorion dau	POLICY CYF1, C16 - Bae Hirael, Bangor	Object	<p>This site is located directly adjacent to Traeth Lafan Special Protection Area, Y Fenai a Bae Conwy Special Area of Conservation, Traeth Lafan Site of Special Scientific Interest and Traeth Lafan Local Nature Reserve. Any proposal to develop the site will need to demonstrate that it will not have an adverse effect on the site features. The requirements of the 2010 Habitat Regulations apply. Drainage proposals for development will need to take into</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b></p> <p>Comment noted – in accordance with the relative policies included within the Local Development Plan along with national policy the necessary consideration will be given to any nearby environmental designation.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Cynllunio) [1521]			account the proximity of protected sites and in particular any nearby watercourses that are hydrologically connected to protected sites, ensuring that discharges do not affect water quality within protected sites.	<b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1634	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C16 - Bae Hirael, Bangor	Object	Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.  Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.  The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>

## 2) Amlwch

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
824	Cyngor Tref Amlwch (Mrs M Hughes) [1266]	POLICY CYF1, C28 - Former Shell Site, Amlwch	Object	Council feel there should be an option on the C28 area - industry and dwellings - starter homes	<b>Partially accept</b> - Policy CYF4 promotes alternative uses on employment sites when justification for this has been accepted. Inevitably, when considering any alternative use, consideration would have to be given to the policies within the plan in its entirety, i.e. the policies that are relevant to the uses in question. It is not believed that robust evidence has been submitted which

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>requires the Plan to be amended.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB10</b></p>
1649	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C28 - Former Shell Site, Amlwch	Support	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area. The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area. Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset. Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1650	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C29 - Llwyn Onn Industrial Estate, Amlwch	Support	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area. Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1651	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths )	POLICY CYF1, C29 - Llwyn Onn Industrial Estate,	Support	The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area. Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2680]	Amlwch		<p>Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.</p> <p>Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.</p>	<b>No Change</b>

### 3) Holyhead

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1283	Mon a Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills) [2937]	POLICY CYF1, C11 - Parc Cybi, Holyhead	Object	The Cae Glas area is shown as an employment site but is wildlife rich and prone to flooding. It should be protected from economic/industrial development.	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – There was no wildlife allocation on the site, and the site is not within a flood zone.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1626	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C11 - Parc Cybi, Holyhead	Support	This site is crossed by 90mm and 125mm water mains along the western and eastern boundaries which may restrict development density for the site. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights of access to its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1627	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C11 - Parc Cybi, Holyhead	Support	Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1686	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C11 - Parc Cybi, Holyhead	Support	The site is crossed by pumped rising sewer main which may restrict development density for the site. Ty Mawr Sewage Pumping Station (SPS) is located within the site and an assessment of the SPS will be required to establish whether all the flows from the proposed allocation can be accommodated or whether future improvements to the SPS will be required to allow all the proposed development to proceed. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1628	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C12 – Penrhos Industrial Estate, Caergybi	Support	Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.  The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area.  The site is located adjacent to Holyhead WwTW which may give rise to odour, fly and noise nuisance for any development in close proximity to the works. As such your authority may wish to consider providing a buffer zone between the works and any proposed development site.  Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1652	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C30 – Anglesey Aluminium, Caergybi	Support	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.  * The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area. Potential	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	
1653	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C30 – Anglesey Aluminium, Caergybi	Support	The site is located adjacent to Holyhead WwTW which may give rise to odour, fly and noise nuisance for any development in close proximity to the works. As such your authority may wish to consider providing a buffer zone between the works and any proposed development site.  * Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1654	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C31 - Former Eaton Electrical, Caergybi	Support	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1655	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C31 - Former Eaton Electrical, Caergybi	Support	Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1689	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C31 - Former Eaton Electrical, Caergybi	Object	Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset. There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	No change is required to address the issues raised. <b>No Change</b>
1656	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C32 - Kingsland, Caergybi	Support	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area. Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the density achievable on site	<b>Note supporting comment</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1657	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C32 - Kingsland, Caergybi	Support	Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Note supporting comment</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1690	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C32 - Saffle Kingsland, Caergybi	Support	Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset. There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<b>Comment Noted</b> The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the issues raised. <b>No Change</b>
829	Robert Llewelyn Jones [3058]	POLICY CYF1, C35 – Holyhead Port,	Object	I am objecting to a Conservation Area containing numerous residential amenities being shown as being land marked	<b>Do not accept</b> - Holyhead Port is protected as a reserve employment site, specifically as it has been identified as an Enterprise Zone site by the Welsh

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
		Caergybi		<p>for business use.</p> <p>The area is covered by the SPG for Holyhead Beach and by a lease held by the County Council.</p> <p>To show clearly on the constraints map that this area is not for the extension of the Port facilities and has to be retained as a public open space.</p>	<p>Government, to contribute towards the Energy Island Programme's objectives. As noted in the Policy, justification would be required of the need to develop it for employment opportunities within use class B1, B2 or B8. Allocating the land does not prohibit any plans which could be associated with improving the Port.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1286	Mon a Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills) [2937]	POLICY CYF1, C35 – Holyhead Port, Caergybi	Object	In the area shown as an employment site, Newry Beach should be protected from economic/ industrial development.	<p><b>Do not accept</b> - Holyhead Port is protected as a reserve employment site, specifically as it has been identified as an Enterprise Zone site by the Welsh Government, to contribute towards the Energy Island Programme's objectives.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1382	Conygar StenalineLtd [3304]	POLICY CYF1, C35 – Holyhead Port, Caergybi	Object	<p>The inclusion of the port area as an Energy Island Programme "reserve site" within Policy CYF1 is unnecessarily restrictive and detrimental to the port's long term development and viability.</p> <p>This policy is fundamentally flawed and conceived without an understanding of the challenges and opportunities the</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> - Holyhead Port is protected as a reserve employment site, specifically as it has been identified as an Enterprise Zone site by the Welsh Government, to contribute towards the Energy Island Programme's objectives. As noted in the Policy, justification would be required of the need to develop it for employment opportunities within use class B1, B2 or B8. Allocating the land does not prohibit any plans which could be associated with</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>port faces over the plan period.</p> <p>Policy CYF1 conflicts with the objectives of Policy CYF7 and the role which the port can play in the regeneration of the town and tourism promotion.</p> <p>There is sufficient alternative land in Holyhead allocated for employment uses (200+ ha) to support the exclusion of the port from this policy.</p> <p>Proposed amendment to Policy CYF1 to delete any reference to Holyhead Port as a "reserve site" (C35wg) for the purposes of the Anglesey Energy Island Programme.</p>	<p>improving the Port.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1662	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C35 – Holyhead Port, Caergybi	Support	Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area. The sewerage network in the area is extensive and where sewers cross potential development sites this will restrict development density for the site, and protection measures in respect of these assets will be required. A number of Sewage Pumping Stations (SPS) are located in the area and may need assessment to ascertain their capacity dependant on the location and type of development proposed.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 4) Llangefni

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1629	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C13 - Bryn Cefni Industrial Estate, Llangefni	Support	<p>Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>The sewerage network in the area is extensive and where sewers cross potential development sites this will restrict development density for the site, and protection measures in respect of these assets will be required. Llangefni Main Sewage Pumping Station is located in the area and may need assessment to ascertain its capacity dependant on the location and type of development proposed.</p> <p>Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1053	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY CYF1, C14 – Land to the north of Lledwigan Farm	Object	<p>The potential loss of BMV land could result in the permanent loss of approximately 40 hectares. The majority of the land is included in allocations TRA1, C14 and C15 and the plan has limited evidence to demonstrate that paragraph 4.10 has been considered at all in allocating these sites for development.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> - Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land was one of many considerations taken into account when assessing sites for employment purposes, in line with para 4.10.1 PPW.</p> <p>Through the spatial strategy and site deliverability assessment process the Council has exhausted all other potential means to deliver the employment needs in Llangefni.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1402	Bob Parry & Co Ltd [3342]	POLICY CYF1, C14 – Land to the north of	Object	<p>Include the Dafarn Newydd site as an alternative to the Lledwigan Farm site. The proposed alternative site for employment in Llangefni is a sustainable development</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – The Employment Land Survey identifies the need for a main employment site in Llangefni. This allocation reflects the allocation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
		Lledwigan Farm		proposal. The suggested site at Dafarn Newydd is an appropriate addition to the settlement, and would perform better against the LDP's criteria than site C14 at Lledwigan Farm.	<p>included within the Unitary Development Plan (stopped in 2005). Other potential options and locations were assessed, however, it was concluded that the Lledwigan Farm site was more suitable due to its accessibility to the A55. Allocating the site is in keeping with the Plan's classification strategy, as Llangefni is identified as a service Centre. Furthermore, it is noted that the site has been identified as an enterprise zone by the Welsh Government, in an attempt to realise the Energy Island Programme's objectives. The Enterprise Zone allocation is a sign of national and local commitment to develop the site for employment purposes.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1630	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C14 – Land to the north of Lledwigan Farm	Support	Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1631	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C14 – Land to the north of Lledwigan Farm	Support	Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1687	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths )	POLICY CYF1, C14 – Land to the north of Lledwigan	Support	The site is crossed by a pumped rising foul main which may restrict development density for the site. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights of access to its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2680]	Farm		respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset. The site is adjacent to a pumped rising main and Llangefni Main SPS. An assessment of the SPS may be required to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether improvements to the SPS' will be required to allow development to proceed. Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the nearest point of adequacy on the sewerage network.	<b>No Change</b>
1054	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY CYF1, C15 – Creamery Land, Llangefni	Object	The potential loss of BMV land could result in the permanent loss of approximately 40 hectares. The majority of the land is included in allocations TRA1, C14 and C15 and the plan has limited evidence to demonstrate that paragraph 4.10 has been considered at all in allocating these sites for development.	<p><b>Do not accept</b> - Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land was one of many considerations taken into account when assessing sites for employment purposes, in line with para 4.10.1 PPW.</p> <p>Through the spatial strategy and site deliverability assessment process the Council has exhausted all other potential means to deliver the employment needs in Llangefni.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1632	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C15 – Creamery Land, Llangefni	Support	This site is crossed by a 400mm water main which will restrict development density for the site. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights of access to its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1633	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	POLICY CYF1, C15 – Creamery	Support	Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]	Land, Llangefni			<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1688	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C15 – Creamery Land, Llangefni	Support	The site is adjacent to a pumped rising main and Llangefni Main SPS. Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the nearest point of adequacy on the sewerage network. The provision of sewerage for the potential development site can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended). An assessment of the SPS may be required to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether improvements to the SPS' will be required to allow development to proceed. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
999	Watkin Jones (Mr Stuart Hardy) [3159]	Map 4 - Llangefni	Object	Land at Tan y Capel, Llangefni. The above information, which is supplemented by a comprehensive sustainability appraisal of the site, indicates that the site is suitable for employment uses and should be included for allocation within the JLDP. The site is accessible, available, deliverable and developable and can help Anglesey/Gwynedd meet its employment land requirements throughout the plan period. The site is therefore considered to be appropriate to be brought forward due to its highly sustainable location in Llangefni, which is recognised within the JLDP as a priority area for development.	<b>Do not accept</b> - The representation seeks the inclusion of the site for employment purposes. The Employment Land Review which has been carried out has comprehensively assessed the required need for employment land during the plan period and as a result the Plan provides for there the recognised need. No information was submitted which emphasised that the requirement was beyond that identified. Also no information was submitted to support the suitability of the objection site as opposed to other sites which have been allocated within the Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
1002	Owen Devenport Ltd (Mr Berwyn Owen) [2755]	Map 4 - Llangefni	Object	Land at Dafarn Newydd, Llangefni. The proposed alternative site for employment in Llangefni is a sustainable development proposal. The suggested site at Dafarn Newydd is an appropriate addition to the settlement, and would perform better against the LDP's criteria than C14 at Lledwigan Farm.	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – The Employment Land Survey identifies the need for a main employment site in Llangefni. This allocation reflects the allocation included within the Unitary Development Plan (stopped in 2005). Other potential options and locations were assessed, however, it was concluded that the Lledwigan Farm site was more suitable due to its accessibility to the A55. Allocating the site is in keeping with the Plan's classification strategy, as Llangefni is identified as a service Centre. Furthermore, it is noted that the site has been identified as an enterprise zone by the Welsh Government, in an attempt to realise the Energy Island Programme's objectives. The Enterprise Zone allocation is a sign of national and local commitment to develop the site for employment purposes.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 5) Blaenau Ffestiniog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1636	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths )	POLICY CYF1, C18 - Safle Tanygrisiau, Blaenau	Support	Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2680]	Ffestiniog		The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area.  Blaenau Ffestiniog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area	<b>No Change</b>
433	Ffestiniog Town Council (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	CYF1, C18  TANYGRISIAU  BLAENAU FFESTINIOG	Support	On the proposals map, Ffestiniog Town Council supports the designation on land surrounding Rehau as a zone to be developed for industry. Space is needed to enable business to expand.	<b>Note the supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

## 6) Caernarfon

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1617	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C5 – Cibyn Industrial Estate, Caernarfon	Object	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.  The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area. Part of the site is crossed by a surface water sewer which may restrict development density for the site. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1618	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths )	POLICY CYF1, C5 – Cibyn Industrial Estate,	Object	The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Caernarfon Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2680]	Caernarfon		through developer contributions.	<p>engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
799	First Investments Ltd [3091]	POLICY CYF1, C19 - Peblig, Caernarfon	Object	<p>FIL object to the current wording of this policy which, instead of promoting investment and improvements to existing employment space, will result in, at best, retaining the status quo at Peblig Mill Industrial Estate owned which is characterised by old and, in some cases, defunct employment floorspace with a high proportion of vacancies. The policy should instead promote investment in existing employment stock and where necessary, promote alternative uses on the Peblig site that are capable of delivering investment and improvements to the overall quality of employment floorspace.</p> <p>FIL request that the policy be amended to include the following changes;</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Recognise the viability and vacancy issues in relation to this site and support the redevelopment of existing sites in need of investment;</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Promote alternative uses where they are able to support such redevelopment/investment at the Peblig site potentially through a link to an amended draft Policy CYF4;</p>	<p><b>Partially accept</b> - Policy CYF4 promotes alternative uses on employment sites when justification for this has been accepted. Inevitably, when considering any alternative use, consideration would have to be given to the policies within the plan in its entirety, i.e. the policies that are relevant to the uses in question. It is not believed that robust evidence has been submitted which requires the Plan to be amended.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB10</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				☑ Remove hierarchal approach to employment allocations, particularly given the differences in definitions between the Evidence Base and Draft Policy	
1637	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C19 - Peblig, Caernarfon	Object	Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area. This site is crossed by a water main which will restrict development density for the site. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights of access to its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1638	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C19 - Peblig, Caernarfon	Object	<p>Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.</p> <p>The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Caernarfon Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 7) Porthmadog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1086	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhorïa dau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY CYF1, C8 – Porthmadog Business Park	Object	The whole site is within flood zone C1. However, flood modelling work suggests that the actual risk to the site is low due to the flood defences within the area. NRW would expect any planning application to be supported by a Flood Consequence Assessment to ensure that development is adequately protected.	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – The majority of the land protected has already been developed. A Stage 2 Strategic Flood Consequence Assessment has been carried out by Gwynedd Consultancy for Porthmadog Business Park, which shows that there is only a small flood risk in this area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1623	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C8 – Porthmadog Business Park	Support	<p>Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991</p> <p>Porthmadog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 8) Pwllheli

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
105	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru (Mr Gareth Thomas)	POLICY CYF1, C6 - Adwy'r Hafan, Pwllheli	Object	Site C6 is within flood zone C1 of Welsh Government's TAN15: Development Advice Maps. The flood risk has not been assessed. Locating a new employment unit within the site would contradict national policy TAN15. The SFCA, section 9.3 states that none of the allocations fall within	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – the majority of the land protected has already been developed.</p> <p>Employment use, according to TAN15: Development and Flood Risk, is considered as a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2757]			zones C1 or C2. There may be risk of flooding due to a breach of the defences (sand dunes) along the eastern boundary, and the potential for flood water to enter the site from over the quay wall to the west of the site.	<p>'less vulnerable' development. In accordance with TAN15, development applications in C1 and C2 Flood Zones should be considered in cases where it is possible to prove that developments contribute towards key employment objectives, supported by the Local Authority and other partners, in order to sustain a settlement or region. Any potential planning application on the site would have to comply with the requirements outlined in TAN15 and be supported by a comprehensive Flood Consequence Assessment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1082	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhorïa dau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY CYF1, C6 - Adwy'r Hafan, Pwllheli	Object	<p>The land is located within flood zone C1 of the Welsh Government's TAN15: Development Advice Maps. Developing this land for employment use would contradict national policy guidance contained within TAN15. NRW considers that the flood risk associated with this site has not been adequately assessed.</p> <p>NRW recommends that either a stage 2 or stage 3 SFCA is prepared and forwarded to NRW for further assessment to demonstrate that developing this site for employment use would comply with the requirements of TAN15 or that development brought forward under this allocation includes no erection of new employment units within the site.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> - Comment noted. The points raised will be further considered when a planning application is submitted, together with any site development briefs which will be prepared.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1619	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	POLICY CYF1, C6 - Adwy'r Hafan, Pwllheli	Support	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this	<b>Note supporting comment</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			development area.  A sewage pumping station (SPS) is located within the site and an assessment may be required to establish whether the flows from this site can be accommodated or whether future improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed. Should the existing sewerage infrastructure not be sufficient to accommodate the proposed level of growth the provision of sewerage infrastructure can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).	<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1620	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C6 - Adwy'r Hafan, Pwllheli	Support	Pwllheli Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

### 13) Gaerwen

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1658	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C33 – Gaerwen Industrial Estate, Gaerwen	Object	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area. Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the density achievable on site.	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
1659	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C33 – Gaerwen Industrial Estate, Gaerwen	Object	The proposed employment allocations in Gaerwen represent a substantial area of land for development for which the potential demands are unknown at present. It is essential that we understand these demands in order to allow us to assess the capacity of Gaerwen Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) to accept the domestic demands from this development area.	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1691	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C33 – Gaerwen Industrial Estate, Gaerwen	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment is required to determine an adequate point of connection to the public sewer and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages. Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the sewerage network from parts of the site, which can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1663	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	POLICY CYF1, C33 – Gaerwen	Object	Off-site water mains may be required to serve the site. These can be provided through a water requisition scheme under Sections 41 - 44 of the Water Industry Act 1991.	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]	Industrial Estate, Gaerwen			<p>during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1664	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C36 – Extension to Gaerwen Industrial Estate, Gaerwen	Object	The proposed employment allocations in Gaerwen represent a substantial area of land for development for which the potential demands are unknown at present. It is essential that we understand these demands in order to allow us to assess the capacity of Gaerwen Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) to accept the domestic demands from this development area.	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1692	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C36 – Extension to Gaerwen Industrial Estate, Gaerwen	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment is required to determine an adequate point of connection to the public sewer and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				planning stages. Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the sewerage network from parts of the site, which can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).	<b>No Change</b>
1180	Llanfihangel Esc Community Council (Alun Foulkes) [3121]	POLICY CYF1, C38 - Parc Gwyddoniaeth Menai	Object	Concerns regarding overdevelopment of the existing industrial estate.  Creating a new employment site (C38) is totally inappropriate for the village for a number of reasons such as the effect of traffic, surface water, sewerage and the visual impact. There is already a large employment allocation already in Gaerwen which is over half the size of the village with a number of empty/vacant land and units.	<b>Do not accept</b> – By now, planning permission has been granted for the site in question, therefore there is a firm intention to develop the site.  <b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1287	Mon and Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills) [2937]	POLICY CYF1, C38 - Parc Gwyddoniaeth Menai	Object	This should be continued as a farm, ideally as an educational/demonstration resource.	<b>Do not accept</b> – By now, planning permission has been granted for the site in question, therefore there is a firm intention to develop the site.  <b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1666	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C38 - Parc Gwyddoniaeth Menai	Support	Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1667	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C38 - Parc Gwyddoniaeth Menai	Object	The proposed employment allocations in Gaerwen represent a substantial area of land for development for which the potential demands are unknown at present. It is essential that we understand these demands in order to allow us to assess the capacity of Gaerwen Wastewater	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Treatment Works (WwTW) to accept the domestic demands from this development area.	engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1694	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C38 - Parc Gwyddoniaeth Menai	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment is required to determine an adequate point of connection to the public sewer and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages. Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the sewerage network from parts of the site, which can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>

## 21) Bethesda

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1635	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C17 - Felin Fawr, Bethesda	Support	Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.  * Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.</p> <p>Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area</p>	

### 23) Llanberis

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1641	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C21 - Glynrhonwy, Llanberis	Support	<p>Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area. Glan Rhonwy Sewage Pumping Station is located in the area and may need assessment to ascertain its capacity dependant on the type of development proposed.</p> <p>Llanberis Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 25) Nefyn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1645	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	POLICY CYF1, C25 – Nefyn Industrial	Support	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area. There are isolated incidents of flooding	<b>Note supporting comment</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]	Estate, Nefyn		in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. Morfa Nefyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

## 26) Penrhyndeudraeth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1621	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C7 - Penrhyndeudr aeth, Business Park	Support	<p>The local water network located within the existing industrial estate is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>A sewage pumping station (SPS) is located within the site and an assessment may be required to establish whether the flows from this site can be accommodated or whether future improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed. Should the existing sewerage infrastructure not be sufficient to accommodate the proposed level of growth the provision of sewerage infrastructure can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991</p>	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1622	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C7 - Penrhyndeudr aeth, Business Park	Support	Penrhyndeudraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1284	Duncan Teed [289]	POLICY CYF1, C22 – Former Ysbyty Bron y Garth, Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	<p>1) Reclassify former hospital from B1 use to C3 &amp; C2 use</p> <p>2) Correct land area mistake in CYF1 and other tables (1.6ha not 16ha)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Building is former NHS hospital (C2 and Grade 2 listed)</li> <li>- Deposit Plan changed use class to B1</li> <li>- Have examined B1 usage and buildings not physically suitable for conversion to B1, Grade 2 listed</li> <li>- No demand for additional business units (vacant units in Penrhyndeudraeth and Blaenau Ffestiniog). Change to B1 not commercially viable</li> <li>- Building needs development to stop deterioration - builder advises to convert to apartments.</li> <li>- Good access onto A496 and tarmac car parks</li> <li>- East side (0.8ha) undeveloped and could develop into housing or employment (hotel, garden centre etc)</li> </ul>	<p><b>Partially accept</b> - The policy will need to be amended in order to include the correct land area.</p> <p>The employment land survey has identified the need for the site as an employment site, and therefore, it is proposed to continue with the protection.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – For accuracy the site area on the table in Policy CYF should be amended.</p> <p><b>Focus Change: NF47</b></p>
1442	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhorïadau Cynllunio)	POLICY CYF1, C22 – Former Ysbyty Bron y Garth, Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	<p>Part of this site is located within Ysbyty Bron y Garth Site of Special Scientific Interest. We would recommend that a design guide is prepared to guide development at the former Bron y Garth Hospital site.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b></p> <p><b>Comment noted</b> - consideration will be given to a Site of Special Scientific Interest when a planning application is submitted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[1521]				received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1642	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C22 – Former Ysbyty Bron y Garth, Penrhyndeudraeth	Support	<p>Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area. The foul flows would lead to Penrhyndeudraeth Pumping Station (SPS) and an assessment of this SPS may be needed to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed.</p> <p>* Penrhyndeudraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1083	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoria dau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY CYF1, C39 – Griffin Industrial Estate, Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	<p>The land is located within flood zone C2 of the Welsh Government's TAN15: Development Advice Maps. Developing this land for employment use would contradict national policy guidance contained within TAN15.</p> <p>NRW recommends that either a stage 2 or stage 3 SFCA is prepared and forwarded to NRW for further assessment to demonstrate that developing this site for employment use would comply with the requirements of TAN15 or that development brought forward under this allocation includes no erection of new employment units within the site.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – The majority of the land protected has already been developed.</p> <p>Employment use, according to TAN15: Development and Flood Risk, is considered as a 'less vulnerable' development. In accordance with TAN, development applications in C1 and C2 Flood Zones should be considered in cases where it is possible to prove that developments contribute towards key employment objectives, supported by the Local Authority and other partners, in order to sustain a settlement or region. Any potential planning application on the site would have to comply with the requirements outlined in TAN15 and be supported by a comprehensive Flood</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Consequence Assessment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
106	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru (Mr Gareth Thomas) [2757]	POLICY CYF1, C39 – Griffin Industrial Estate, Penrhyneudraeth	Object	<p>C39: Griffin Industrial Estate, Penrhyneudraeth - is within flood zone C2 of Welsh Government's TAN15: Development Advice Maps. Locating a new employment unit within the site would contradict national policy TAN15. The SFCA, section 9.3 states that none of the allocations fall within zones C1 or C2. The flood risk has not been assessed.</p> <p>Either a stage 2/stage 3 SFCA submitted that demonstrates the site would comply with TAN15 requirement, or that no NEW employment units to be provided within this site.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – The majority of the land protected has already been developed.</p> <p>Employment use, according to TAN15: Development and Flood Risk, is considered as a 'less vulnerable' development. In accordance with TAN, development applications in C1 and C2 Flood Zones should be considered in cases where it is possible to prove that developments contribute towards key employment objectives, supported by the Local Authority and other partners, in order to sustain a settlement or region. Any potential planning application on the site would have to comply with the requirements outlined in TAN15 and be supported by a comprehensive Flood Consequence Assessment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1681	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C39 – Griffin Industrial Estate, Penrhyneudraeth	Support	<p>Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
		eth		<p>flows foul flows arising from this development area. The foul flows would lead to Penrhyndeudraeth Pumping Station (SPS) and an assessment of this SPS may be needed to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed.</p> <p>Penrhyndeudraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.</p>	
1621	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C7 - Penrhyndeudraeth, Business Park	Support	<p>The local water network located within the existing industrial estate is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>A sewage pumping station (SPS) is located within the site and an assessment may be required to establish whether the flows from this site can be accommodated or whether future improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed. Should the existing sewerage infrastructure not be sufficient to accommodate the proposed level of growth the provision of sewerage infrastructure can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1622	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C7 - Penrhyndeudraeth, Business Park	Support	<p>Penrhyndeudraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 27) Penygroes

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1643	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C23 – Penygroes Industrial Estate, Penygroes, Gwynedd	Support	<p>Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area. Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a number of sewers. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.</p> <p>Penygroes is served by Llanllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
926	Mr Robert Jones [3107]	Map 27 - Penygroes, Gwynedd	Object	<p>We wish to object to the development boundary proposed for the Local Service Centre of Penygroes. We wish to propose a site adjacent to the Industrial Estate to be included within the development boundary of Penygroes. The inclusion of the site within the development boundary of Penygroes would therefore be considered as a logical extension to the development boundary to provide a mix of commercial, community and leisure development which could include community services including a petrol filling station and retail shop, together with leisure services including a tourist information centre and tourist related workshops.</p> <p>We wish to see the development boundary for Penygroes reviewed and altered to include the site adjacent to the Industrial Estate within the development boundary which would form a logical extension to the development boundary to provide a mix of commercial, community and leisure development which could include community services including a petrol filling station and retail shop,</p>	<p><b>Do Not Accept</b> – It is considered that the Plan doesn't prohibit the types of development which are suggested within the objection, provided that the site is appropriate and lies directly adjacent to the development boundary. When considering retail development reference should be made to the considerations as set out in section 10.3 of Planning Policy Wales (Edition 8, 2016).</p> <p>Further, reference should also be made to Policy ISA2: Community Facilities which highlights the considerations relating to leisure and community uses on appropriate sites adjacent to the development boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, it isn't considered necessary to amend the boundary in accordance with the objection.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				together with leisure services including a tourist information centre and tourist related workshops.	Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

## 28) Tywyn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1624	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C9 – Pendre Industrial Estate, Tywyn	Support	Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.  The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area.  Tywyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

## 39) Y Ffôr

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1385	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY CYF1, C10 - Adjacent to the petrol station, Y Ffor	Object	We support C10 around the garage (Tir Dolwar). While we note that the 2.8ha C27 employment site (Industrial estate, partly included in the GUDP, is still vacant, we suggest that C10 should therefore be allocated flexibly, whether to housing or employment, depending on emerging priorities and development proposals.	<b>Partially accept</b> - Policy CYF4 promotes alternative uses on employment sites when justification for this has been accepted. Inevitably, when considering any alternative use, consideration would have to be given to the policies within the plan in its entirety, i.e. the policies that are relevant to the uses in question.  The safeguarded employment site will also be amended to include the previous employment site. However the extent of the allocation won't

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>reflect the whole objection site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB10</b></p>
1625	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C10 - Adjacent to the petrol station, Y Ffor	Object	<p>* Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Y Ffor Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1647	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C27 - Y Ffôr Industrial Estate, Y Ffôr	Object	<p>* Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the foul flows arising from this development area. Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				the asset	<b>No Change</b>
1648	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C27 - Y Ffôr Industrial Estate, Y Ffôr	Object	* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Y Ffor Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>

### 53) Llangristiolus

0	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1014	Watkin Jones (Mr Stuart Hardy) [3159]	Map 53 - Llangristiolus	Object	Land adj Llanfawr Newydd. The above information, which is supplemented by a comprehensive sustainability appraisal of the site, indicates that the site holds strategic importance in Anglesey and should be allocated for a range of uses (light industrial/commercial/mixed uses/leisure) that can be brought forward during the plan period. In summary, the site has excellent access; could be an enabling factor in the initiating of development on the adjacent service station site, would increase the critical mass or gravity pull with investors and would provide synergy between mixed used development and employments.	<b>Do not accept</b> – The representation seeks the inclusion of the site for employment purposes. The Employment Land Review which has been carried out has comprehensively assessed the required need for employment land during the plan period and as a result the Plan provides for the recognised need. No information was submitted which emphasised that the requirement was beyond that identified. Also no information was submitted to support the suitability of the objection site as opposed to other sites which have been allocated within the Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was

0	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

## II) Ferrodio

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1404	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	POLICY CYF1, C20 - Former Friction Dynamex Site, Caernarfon	Object	<p>Only partially identifies the extent of the former Friction Dynamex site as being allocated and subject to a policy support for development. This allocation is therefore artificially and inaccurately defined, and does not reflect the extent of the previously developed land on the site.</p> <p>The plan needs to provide a more flexible, responsive and pragmatic approach to redeveloping this site. The site whilst potentially appropriate for B2 development is unlikely ever to secure such development as a single occupant. Perpetuating this policy approach will unlikely result in the development of the site for B2 uses.</p> <p>The site should be deleted from Policies PS10 and CYF1 and identified as a specific regeneration / mixed use development site.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	<p><b>Partially accept</b> - Policy CYF4 promotes alternative uses on employment sites when justification for this has been accepted. Inevitably, when considering any alternative use, consideration would have to be given to the policies within the plan in its entirety, i.e. the policies that are relevant to the uses in question.</p> <p>The safeguarded employment site will also be amended to include the previous employment site. However the extent of the allocation won't reflect the whole objection site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is proposed that new wording is included in the explanation paragraphs to the policy CYF4 which will refer to the Supplementary Planning Guidance it is proposed to prepare in relation to change of use on employment sites.</p> <p>The safeguarded employment site will also be amended for clarity.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>Focussed change: NF132</b>
1639	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	CYF1, C20 - Former Friction Dynamex Site, Caernarfon	Object	<p>Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>An extensive distance of off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage system. Where no public sewerage facilities are available then the provisions of Circular 10/99 Planning Requirement in respect of the 'Use of Non-Mains Sewerage Incorporating Septic Tanks in New Development' apply and consultation with the Environment Agency is required. The provision of sewerage for the potential development site can be acquired through the sewer requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 (as amended).</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1640	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	CYF1, C20 - Former Friction Dynamex Site, Caernarfon	Object	<p>If a connection was made to the public sewerage network, the proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Caernarfon Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the issues raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1660	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths )	POLICY CYF1, C34 - Land near Mona Airfield, Mona	Support	<p>* Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the foul flows</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2680]			arising from this development area. Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	<b>No Change</b>
1644	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C24 - Agricultural Park, Llanystumdwy	Support	<p>* Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* There are no public sewers in close proximity to this site, as such the provisions of 'Circular 10/99 Planning Requirement in respect of the Use of Non-Mains Sewerage in New Development' apply and potential developers may wish to consider installing a private package plant treatment works. Consultation with Natural Resources Wales would be required on this matter</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1661	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C34 - Land near Mona Airfield, Mona	Support	<p>* Mona Sewage Pumping Station (SPS) is located near the site and an assessment of the SPS may be required to establish whether all the flows from the proposed allocation can be accommodated or whether future improvements to the SPS will be required to allow all the proposed development to proceed.</p> <p>* Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1665	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C37 - Former site of Shell, Rhosgoch	Object	<p>* Off-site water mains may be required to serve the site. These can be provided through a water requisition scheme under Sections 41 - 44 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1693	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C37 - Former site of Shell, Rhosgoch	Object	* There are no public sewers in close proximity to this site. The nearest public sewers are approximately 2km away in Amlwch to the north, or approximately 2km to the south east in Rhosybol. Off-site sewers would be required however a development of this size would result in expensive off-site solutions for sewerage provision. Where no public sewerage facilities are available in close proximity, as with this site, then the provisions of 'Circular 10/99 Planning Requirement in respect of the Use of Non-Mains Sewerage in New Development' apply and potential developers may wish to consider installing a private package plant treatment works. Consultation with Natural Resources Wales would be required on this matter.	<b>Comment Noted</b>  The issues raised will receive further consideration during the planning application stage, through engagement with DCWW.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No change is required to address the issues raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1275	Karen Taylor [3291]	POLICY CYF1, C26 - Wynstay Farmer's site, Rhosfawr	Object	Pease remove the area highlighted in green from employment allocation C26: - Unacceptable extension of existing site into agricultural land - Existing developed site appears under utilised - It would have unacceptable impact on residential amenity. Existing site already causes noise problems from operations and movement of large vehicles. - Inadequate highway network to accommodate additional use. Dangerous access onto the B4354 - Unsustainable location - not served by regular bus service, only accessible by car - Unacceptable visual intrusion into the open countryside - Fields are potentially of high biodiversity value - unimproved grassland.	<b>Do not accept</b> – The Employment Land Review has recognised a need for additional land in Llyn which will serve the settlements of Pwllheli and Porthmadog. As a result of constraints (flooding) relating to possible sites in Pwllheli and Porthmadog it was considered necessary to look at alternative option, including the deliverability of current employment sites. The current employment site at Wynstay Farmers was considered a viable option to satisfy the local employment requirements.  The site is a current employment site with a good road network serving the site.  <b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1378	Mr & Mrs R Moore [3302]	POLICY CYF1, C26 - Wynnstay Farmer's site, Rhosfawr	Object	<p>Unacceptable impact on residential amenity. Existing site already causes noise &amp; disturbance problems. A bigger site would exacerbate this &amp; bring the use much closer to the back of our house which would be dominating and oppressive.</p> <p>There are still plenty of empty spaces on other industrial estates in the locality that are more suitable and could meet a need if there is one.</p> <p>Inadequate highway network to accommodate more use. Junction to the B4354 is dangerous.</p> <p>Unsuitable location - not served by a regular bus service. Only accessible by car. Too far to walk and no pavement from Y Ffôr.</p> <p>The designation completely removed as an employment site or the area in the attached plan highlighted in green removed from the designation so it contained to the existing developed site.</p>	<p><b>Do not accept</b> – The Employment Land Review has recognised a need for additional land in Llyn which will serve the settlements of Pwllheli and Porthmadog. As a result of constraints (flooding) relating to possible sites in Pwllheli and Porthmadog it was considered necessary to look at alternative option, including the deliverability of current employment sites. The current employment site at Wynstay Farmers was considered a viable option to satisfy the local employment requirements.</p> <p>The site is a current employment site with a good road network serving the site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> - No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1646	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C26 - Wynnstay Farmer's site, Rhosfawr	Support	<p>* Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* There are no public sewers in close proximity to this site, as such the provisions of 'Circular 10/99 Planning Requirement in respect of the Use of Non-Mains Sewerage in New Development' apply and potential developers may wish to consider installing a private package plant treatment works. Consultation with Natural Resources</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Wales would be required on this matter.	

## The Visitor Economy

### Context and Introduction

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
294	Cyfeillion Llyn (Mrs Sian Parri) [2871]	7.3.46	Object	It should be clearly noted that there is conflict between promoting tourism in the traditional way and safeguarding the Welsh language.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The plan should not be read in isolation. The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic papers, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations and, maintaining and creating sustainable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
191	Kingsbridge Caravan Park (Mr Andrew Bate) [2778]	7.3.47	Support	Tourism associated with caravan and camping parks brings a significant amount of money into the Anglesey and Gwynedd areas. This is "new" money which is injected into the local economy. I	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p>The plan acknowledges the importance of tourism to the economy of the plan area.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				would like to see a more positive approach, by the authorities, toward the development and quality of existing caravan and camping parks. Park owners need to gain some reward from their investments.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

### PS11 – The Visitor Economy

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
184	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Object	<p>Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as educational facilities, fishing lakes, water sports centres, mountain biking tracks, quad biking, high wire facilities, rock climbing opportunities, amphitheatre for concerts, hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate. All the abovementioned facilities will create employment and support rural economies and should be supported on previously used land in the rural area.</p> <p>Allow scope and flexibility in the policy for alternative and viable end uses of mineral sites where appropriate.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Policies TWR1: Visitor Attractions and Facilities, TWR2: Holiday Accommodation, TWR3: Static Caravan, Chalet Sites and Permanent Alternative Camping Accommodation allow for suitable developments on suitable previously developed land which includes minerals and waste sites (PPW, 2014, figure 4.3)</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No changes to policy but include the definition of the term, “Previously developed land” in the Glossary of terms to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF111</b></p>
185	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Object	<p>Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as educational facilities, fishing lakes, water sports</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b> Policies TWR1: Visitor Attractions and Facilities, TWR2: Holiday Accommodation, TWR3: Static Caravan, Chalet Sites and Permanent Alternative</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				centres, mountain biking tracks, quad biking, high wire facilities, rock climbing opportunities, amphitheatre for concerts, hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate. All the above mentioned facilities will create employment and support rural economies and should be supported on previously used land in the rural area.  Allow scope and flexibility in the policy for alternative and viable end uses of mineral sites where appropriate	Camping Accommodation allow for suitable developments on suitable previously developed land which includes minerals and waste sites (PPW, 2014, figure 4.3)  <b>Recommendation</b> No changes to policy but include the definition of the term, "Previously Developed Land" in the Glossary of terms to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.  <b>Focussed Change NF111</b>
340	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Object	Self-catering accommodation, such as cottages and apartments, has a significant contribution towards the visitor economy and these types of facility are not considered within Strategic Policy PS11 at the moment.	<b>Accepted</b> Agree that the self-catering industry plays an important role in the tourism of the Plan Area.  <b>Recommendation</b> Amend point 3 of policy to include "holiday cottages and apartments" to ensure the internal consistency of the plan.  <b>Focussed Change NF51</b>
456 & 761	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Object	Bourne Leisure endorses PS11 in principle as it supports the development of a year-round local tourism industry. However, Bourne Leisure considers that point 3 should be redrafted to read:  "Managing, and enhancing the provision of high quality un-serviced tourism accommodation in the form of camping, alternative luxury camping, static or touring caravan or chalet parks."	<b>Accepted</b> Agree that PS11 should aim to improve the quality of the existing tourism developments  <b>Recommendation</b> Amend point 3 to include the word "enhancing" to ensure the internal consistency of the plan  <b>Focussed Change NF51</b>
741	Tom Brooks [3034]	STRATEGIC	Object	Policy PS11 as drafted threatens further	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
		POLICY PS11		<p>development of tourist accommodation through the conversion of existing property to tourist accommodation. Borth-y-Gest already has more than 60% holiday homes or tourist units.</p> <p>Outside peak summer period Borth-y-Gest is not quite a ghost village but further holiday homes would rapidly make it so.</p> <p>PS11 should be amended to read "preventing development that would have an unacceptable adverse effect on tourist attractions, including those developments that could have an adverse impact on pretty villages, including the presence of the Welsh culture and developments that could damage all year round life in tourist appealing villages."</p>	<p>The criteria within policy TWR2: Holiday Accommodation aims to prevent the loss of permanent housing stock, harm the residential character of an area and avoid over concentration of holiday accommodation within areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The proposed change to the text is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
777	Cyngor Cymuned Botwnnog (Mrs Gwenda Roberts) [1541]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Object	<p>The Plan refers to the visitor economy - if this is to be effective, roads, footpaths and cycle paths should be developed and improved. There is an immediate need for the Council to consider these for the benefit of the local residents as well as tourists. If the facilities leading to this special Peninsula were improved, it might be possible to establish an industry here and therefore reduce the numbers who are unemployed.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The Visitor Economy section should not be read in isolation. The plan should be read as whole. The plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development should be managed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This change is not required as it is covered in other parts of the plan and in national policy.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
785	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Object	<p>We acknowledge the important role of caravans in tourism in the JLDP area. Our principal concern is landscape damage from overdevelopment, increasing permanence of tourers and lack of</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Touring caravan sites are considered more acceptable in land use planning terms as having less impact on the landscape than static caravan</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>adequate screening of sites. We argue that the moratorium on new static sites should be extended to touring sites, at least in designated areas, while small additions to existing sites should continue to be permitted in exchange for genuine improvements in visual impact. Tackling these issues would contribute to achieving higher quality rather than a larger quantity of caravan tourism accommodation at the expense of the landscape, implicitly in line with point 3 of PS11. Such improvements should be sought more vigorously and implemented more effectively for all exposed sites, including single statics on individual properties (see submission CPRW23). These concerns should be reflected in strategic policies for tourism.</p>	<p>sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local environment. Policy TWR5 aims to reduce the landscape impact of new and extended touring caravan and camping sites. The policy also does not allow for winter storage of caravans and they should be removed from the site when not in use.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.3.72 states that the councils will require strong evidence for proposals that further units of accommodation on or near the coastline and in the AONBs will not harm the character of the natural resources.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
791	Caravan Club [3039]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Object	<p>In summary the policies relating to tourist accommodation are considered to be overly restrictive and lacking in clarity on the type of development which is acceptable on existing touring caravan sites. The policy should be amended to ensure that the plan does not affect the ability of local tourist businesses from adapting to the changing needs of the visitor economy and does not impact on the future economic viability of these businesses which support local economies, employments and communities.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The Plan acknowledges the importance of tourism and makes plenty of provision for tourism developments. The plan also acknowledges that many of the tourist destinations in the Plan area are in places of high environmental and landscape importance and that any potential development is appropriate in scale and nature to be sympathetic to the character of the area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
860	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Support	Policy PS11 is supported.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No change</b>
1414	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS11	Object	NFU Wales would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development: * Initiatives linked to appropriate tourism; * Leisure, but not if they aren't appropriate to a countryside location and another land use in the locality, including agriculture.	<b>Comment noted</b>  The Plan acknowledges the importance of tourism to rural areas and that any potential new developments need to be appropriate in scale and nature to be sympathetic to the character of the area. <b>Recommendation</b>  No change required to address the representation  <b>No change</b>

#### TWR1 – Visitor Attractions and Facilities

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
186	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY TWR1	Object	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as	<b>Accepted</b>  Policies TWR1: Visitor Attractions and Facilities,

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>educational facilities, fishing lakes, water sports centres, mountain biking tracks, quad biking, high wire facilities, rock climbing opportunities, amphitheatre for concerts, hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate. All the abovementioned facilities will create employment and support rural economies and should be supported on previously used land in the rural area.</p> <p>Remove reference to development boundary. Allow scope and flexibility in the policy for alternative and viable end uses of mineral sites where appropriate</p>	<p>allow for suitable developments on suitable previously developed land which includes minerals and waste sites (PPW, 2014, figure 4.3)</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change to policy but include the definition of the term, "Previously Developed Land" in the Glossary of terms to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF111</b></p>
187	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY TWR1	Object	<p>Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as educational facilities, fishing lakes, water sports centres, mountain biking tracks, quad biking, high wire facilities, rock climbing opportunities, amphitheatre for concerts, hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate. All the abovementioned facilities will create employment and support rural economies and should be supported on previously used land in the rural area.</p> <p>Remove reference to development boundary. Allow scope and flexibility in the policy for alternative and viable end uses of mineral sites where appropriate</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Policies TWR1: Visitor Attractions and Facilities, allow for suitable developments on suitable previously developed land which includes minerals and waste sites (PPW, 2014, figure 4.3)</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change to policy but include the definition of the term, "Previously Developed Land" in the Glossary of terms to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF111</b></p>
396	Welsh Highland Railway	POLICY TWR1	Support	Support.	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	(Mr Graham Farr) [254]				<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
457 & 744	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY TWR1	Object	<p>Policy TWR1 should therefore be redrafted to allow for the sensitive development / reconfiguration / expansion of tourist accommodation that fall outside the settlement boundary, providing that commensurate mitigation measures (for example, the inclusion of a buffer zone and appropriate landscaping) can be implemented to mitigate both direct and indirect impacts.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>National policy guidance states that development in the open countryside, away from existing settlements must be strictly controlled. Criteria 1—3 provide a degree of flexibility for developments that are not located within or adjacent development boundaries.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1170	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY TWR1	Object	<p>Clarification is required as to what is meant by "development boundary". Rather than seek for specific amendments to policy TWR1, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which will be the relevant policies against which to determine its associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion of its associated development from this policy.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The purpose of development boundaries is to direct most development to sites that are within settlements in order to regulate development and to protect the open countryside from inappropriate development. The Plan recognises that some types of development may require a countryside location.</p> <p>It is believed that an adequate emphasis is placed on the Wylfa Newydd project and the economic advantages that would derive from it in the plan. There are other policies within the Plan which include planning principles, which would need to be referred to when responding to applications associated with Wylfa Newydd.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### TWR2 – Holiday Accommodation

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
190	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY TWR2	Support	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate. This policy is supported as long as mineral extraction sites are considered previously developed sites at point 4.	<p><b>Note the Support</b> Policies TWR2: Holiday Accommodation, allow for suitable developments on suitable previously developed land which includes minerals and waste sites (PPW, 2014, figure 4.3)</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change to policy but include the definition of the term, "Previously Developed Land" in the Glossary of terms to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF111</b></p>
193	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY TWR2	Support	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate.	<p><b>Note the Support</b> Policies TWR2: Holiday Accommodation, allow for suitable developments on suitable previously developed land which includes minerals and waste sites (PPW, 2014, figure 4.3)</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				This policy is supported as long as mineral extraction sites are considered previously developed sites at point 4.	<p><b>Recommendation</b> No change to policy but include the definition of the term, "Previously Developed Land" in the Glossary of terms to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF111</b></p>
342	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	POLICY TWR2	Object	<p>It is difficult to quantify what an over-concentration of holiday accommodation is, which leads to a lack of certainty for applicants.</p> <p>Delete or amend part 8 "That the development does not lead to an over-concentration of such accommodation within the area."</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Amend the policy's explanation. An SPG will be published to provide more information about the matter.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change to the policy but including new wording in the policy's explanation to ensure the policy can be easily interpreted.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF52</b></p>
344	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	POLICY TWR2	Object	<p>Support the principle of the policy and in particular part 4, however it does not take account of preserving vernacular buildings with heritage value. In some circumstances, these can be viably developed to help preserve local character and / or Welsh heritage.</p> <p>Amend part 4 to read "In the case of new build accommodation, that the development is located within a development boundary, or makes use of a suitable previously developed site or involves the reuse of a heritage asset that helps preserve local character and/or the Welsh culture"</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The Visitor Economy section should not be read in isolation. The plan should be read as whole. The plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development should be managed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This change is not required as it is covered in other parts of the plan and in national policy.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
742	Tom Brooks [3034]	POLICY TWR2	Object	Much of the loss of housing units for local	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>families has been created by the conversion of existing buildings into "permanently serviced and self-serviced holiday accommodation". This is a deeply damaging trend for villages such as Borth-y-Gest. TWR2 needs amending to protect against any further loss of family accommodation. It currently carries a presumption of granting permission and the caveats are non-specific and undefinable.</p> <p>TWR2 should be amended to delete point 2 (conversion of exiting buildings). A new policy should be added to permit conversion of existing buildings only in the higher ranked settlements in the settlement strategy.</p>	<p>Point 6, 7 and 8 of the policy aims to reduce the impact of holiday accommodation on permanent homes and residential areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1072	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY TWR2	Object	<p>The policy would be strengthened with an explanation of where the Councils consider 'over-concentration' (Clause 8) of certain accommodation might be a risk.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Include reasoned justification in the policy's explanation. An SPG will be published to provide more information about the matter.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change to the policy but including new wording in the policy's explanation to ensure the policy can be easily interpreted.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF52</b></p>
1171	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	7.3.55	Object	<p>This comment applies to paragraphs 7.3.55 - 7.3.80 - Horizon is concerned to ensure that these paragraphs do not impact the construction worker accommodation. Rather than seek for specific amendments to these paragraphs, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed above which would be the relevant policies against which to determine</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is believed that an adequate emphasis is placed in the Plan on the Wylfa Newydd project and the economic advantages that would derive from it. There are other policies within the Plan which include planning principles, which would need to be referred to when responding to applications associated with Wylfa Newydd.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				associated development applications.	<p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### TWR3 – Static Caravan and Chalet Sites and Permanent Alternative Camping Accommodation

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
96	BH&HPA [2733]	POLICY TWR3	Object	<p>Policy TWR3 should adjudge planning applications for holiday caravan parks located within the AONB and SLA's against a common set of criteria which should apply to all parks. If development proposals can demonstrate significant environmental improvements to the design, layout and appearance of a holiday park then they should be encouraged regardless of where they are located. If the overall impact of an existing site is reduced and/or significant economic benefits would result, then there is no sound reason to preclude against additional pitches. The incentive needs to be there to assist in funding these often expensive development projects.</p> <p>Amended Policy</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>1. Delete Point 3</p> <p>2. Amend Point 4 to allow proposals to improve existing static caravan and chalet sites by allowing minor extension to site area, and/or The relocation of units and/or, A minor increase in the number of units on site subject to detailed criteria. See full submission for detailed text.</p>	<p>caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p> <p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
197	Kingsbridge Caravan Park (Mr Andrew Bate) [2778]	POLICY TWR3	Object	<p>Whilst I would agree with the proposal to refuse the development of NEW parks within the AONB, consideration should be given to the proposal to restrict the increase in numbers of units in AONB areas. This may lead to increased demand for second homes from visitors. The effects of this are evident in Rhosneigr and Trearddur Bay.</p> <p>I would like to see a degree of flexibility with</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>each case considered on its own merits and perhaps negotiation between planners and park owners.</p>	<p>such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p> <p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
222	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY TWR3	Support	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
223	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY TWR3	Support	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
308	Point Lynas Caravan Park/Pant y Saer Caravan Park (Mr Peter Hoyland) [2886]	POLICY TWR3	Object	Item 3 iii of Policy TW3 is insufficiently flexible to achieve the policy aims. A small increase in the number of static caravan or chalet pitches on the park will be considered if it can be shown that they are a requirement for an improvement scheme to be viable.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p> <p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
458	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY TWR3	Support	Aspects of TWR3 are supported as it facilitates proposals to improve existing static and chalet sites provided they conform to a number of criteria.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
483	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	POLICY TWR3	Object	The policy effectively places an embargo on additional static caravans within the AONB and SLA's. This provides no incentive to owners and operators to bring forward improvements to their sites. The effective embargo on additional caravans is contrary to National Planning Policy which places an increased emphasis on the	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				economic benefits of tourism.	<p>National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p> <p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
515	Bodafon Caravan Park (Mr Robert Roberts) [180]	POLICY TWR3	Object	<p>Number 1 This paragraph relates to proposals for the development of new Parks and refers to "permanent alternative camping accommodation". There is no definition of "permanent alternative camping accommodation" in the explanation 7.3.60 to 7.3.66 that follows Policy statement TWR3 Does it mean touring caravans , tents or camping, trailer tents, motor homes, pods, yurts, wigwams, and tepees. These have been grouped together and covered in Policy statement TWR5. Policy TWR5 does not differentiate between AONB areas and non-AONB areas. There is therefore possible ambiguity between Policy TWR3 and TWR5.</p> <p>Policy TWR3 needs to provide a definition of "permanent alternative camping accommodation" in a Citation similar to 1 and 2 on page 114. Changes cannot be suggested without being provided with a definition.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b></p> <p>Explanation to the types of alternative camping accommodation can be found in the explanation of policy TWR5 but agree to include the definition on the explanation of this policy.</p> <p>Policy TWR5 covers touring units, while Policy TWR3 covers static/permanent units. Touring caravan and camping sites, are considered more acceptable in land use planning terms as having less of an impact on the landscape that static caravan and chalet sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local landscape.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change to the policy but a definition of "permanent alternative camping accommodation" will be included in the policy's explanation to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF53</b></p>
516 & 1052	Bodafon Caravan Park (Mr Robert Roberts) [180]	POLICY TWR3	Object	<p>POLICY TWR3 3 does not allow any increase in numbers of units. Therefore, no incentive to Park Owners to make improvements</p> <p>Changes to Plan Add: 3(iii) a very minor increase in the number of units</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>on site.</p> <p>Explanations:  Minor is defined in para 7.3.66 as "should be no greater than a 10% increase on the number at the time of the original application".  The definition of minor should be amended to "should be no greater than a 15% increase etc.  Definition of "very minor"  And "Very minor in relation to site area is not defined except in relation to an increase in the number of units and should be no greater than a 10% increase on the number at the time of the original application"</p>	<p>National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p> <p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
517	John Parry [2128]	POLICY TWR3	Object	<p>Explanation 7.3.60 Considers there is a need for further provision of new static caravans and chalets to meet consumer demands.</p> <p>Explanation 7.3.63 considers there is scope for minor static and chalet park extensions as part of a general improvement plan in coastal areas"</p> <p>Explanation 7.3.64 and 7.3.65 Considers that there is no incentive to improve sites if numbers cannot be increased</p> <p>Explanation 7.3.46 Considers that a policy of no extension to existing static parks in AONB contradicts the with the Council's identification of tourism as a key priority</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
519 & 520	Lambe Planning & Design Ltd (Mr Jeremy Lambe) [1674]	POLICY TWR3	Object	<p>The proposed Policy TWR3 does not allow any minor increase in units within the AONB when considering proposals to improve sites. Minor increase in the number of units is required to assist with funding of upgrading. Upgrading requires significant investment. Policy D17 of Gwynedd UDP gives an incentive to upgrade. Minor increase in number of pitches should be allowed to assist in funding relocation of sites within Coastal Change Management Zone.</p> <p>Delete the reference in point 3 of Policy TWR3 sub paragraph iii -which states "the improvements does not increase the number of static caravan or chalet units on the site and utilise the same wording as Point 4 of Policy TWR3 sub paragraph iii which states "a minor increase in the number of units on site will be permitted providing all of the following criteria can be met".</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Agreed that for existing static and chalet parks that are located within the AONB, SLA and Coastal Change Management Zone that a small increase in units will be allowed when supplemented with a business case to justify the increase.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Include following wording to 3iii) Unless, in exceptional circumstances, proposals involve the relocation of existing static and chalet parks that fall within the Coastal Change Management Area.</p> <p>And include following wording to paragraph 7.3.62 "business case / viability"</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF54</b></p>
739	Haulfryn Group Ltd [2986]	POLICY TWR3	Object	Where holiday Caravan Parks are located within the Coastal Change Management a minor increase in the number of pitches, as part of a	<p><b>Accepted</b> Agreed that for existing static and chalet parks that are located within the AONB, SLA and Coastal</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>proposal that relocates pitches away from the shoreline affected by rising sea levels.</p> <p>Holiday Park operations contribute significantly to sustainable local communities by providing a market for local goods and services, as well as providing much needed local employment.</p> <p>A minor increase is necessary to fund the proposal to relocate pitches away from more vulnerable areas to avoid potential loss and fund the investment required to relocate pitches.</p>	<p>Change Management Zone that a small increase in units will be allowed when supplemented with a business case to justify the increase.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Include following wording to 3iii) Unless, in exceptional circumstances, proposals involve the relocation of existing static and chalet parks that fall within the Coastal Change Management Area.</p> <p>And include following wording to paragraph 7.3.62 "business case / viability"</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF54</b></p>
740	Haulfryn Group Ltd [2986]	POLICY TWR3	Object	<p>Policy TWR3 does not allow for a minor increase in pitches within the AONB compared to the existing UDP Policy (D17). To assist with funding the upgrading a site, a minor increase in the number of static holiday caravans/chalets is required.</p> <p>Delete reference in point 3 of TWR3 which states "the improvements does not increase the number of static or chalet units in the site" and utilize the same wording as point 4 of TWR3 which states "a minor increase in the number of units on site will be permitted providing all of the following criteria can be met".</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p> <p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
757	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY TWR3	Object	<p>Bourne Leisure does not object to point 3 and 4 in policy TWR3 as currently drafted would allow the sensitive redevelopment of caravan parks which is key to maintaining the tourism offer in the plan area which in turn has a significant positive impact on the local economy.</p> <p>However, Bourne Leisure considers that it would be beneficial for the wording of this policy to be amended to embody a more positive and flexible</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The Plan acknowledges the importance of tourism to the plan area and allows for sensitive redevelopment of existing parks where that redevelopment does not harm the quality of the surrounding landscape.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				approach whereby the constant state of change in tourism facilities is acknowledged, with redevelopment and site rationalisation to meet the needs of the dynamic tourism market.	Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
782	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cynghorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY TWR3	Support	This policy is supported as it is proposed to refuse new sites and extensions within the AONB and the SLA.  We believe that priority should be given to monitoring compliance with planning permissions, planning conditions, landscaping conditions and conditions on occupancy.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
787	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TWR3	Object	We agree with the continued moratorium on new static sites in AONBs and SLAs, but we are concerned about its relaxation elsewhere. We suggest it is maintained in otherwise unprotected buffer areas of the AONBs and within 2 km of the coast where the greatest pressures have been felt, and that only very small new sites are permitted elsewhere. We agree with continuation of a guideline limit of 10% on expansions of existing sites in all areas in return for genuine environmental improvements, but look for strengthening of effective landscaping plans, colouring standards, monitoring and enforcement.	<b>Not Accepted</b> The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The study concluded that in some areas outside the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas there may be very limited capacity for static caravan/chalet park developments typically comprising of very infrequent, very small scale, well sited, high quality developments.  The supporting text for the policy highlights the importance of sensitive redevelopment to reduce any potential landscape impact.  <b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
790	Caravan Club [3039]	POLICY TWR3	Object	In summary Policy TWR3 is overly restrictive and lack clarity on the type of development which is acceptable on existing touring caravan sites. The policy should be amended to ensure that the plan does not affect the ability of local tourist businesses from adapting to the changing needs of the visitor economy and does not impact on the future economic viability of these businesses which support local economies, employments and communities.	<b>Not Accepted</b> Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.  The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p> <p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
792	Caravan Club [3039]	POLICY TWR3	Object	In summary the policies relating to tourist accommodating are considered to be overly restrictive and lacking in clarity on the type of development which is acceptable on existing touring caravan sites.	<p><b>Accepted</b> Explanation to the types of alternative camping accommodation can be found in the explanation of policy TWR5 but agree to include the definition on the explanation of this policy.</p> <p>Policy TWR5 covers touring units, while Policy TWR3 covers static/permanent units. Touring caravan and camping sites, are considered more acceptable in land use planning terms as having less of an impact on the landscape than static caravan and chalet sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local landscape.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change to the policy but a definition of "permanent alternative camping accommodation" will be included in the policy's explanation to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>Focused Change NF54</b>
485 & 486	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	7.3.63	Object	Para 7.3.63 is inconsistent with Policy TWR3 which allows extensions to sites regardless of the conclusion of the sensitivity and capacity study. Additionally, it is clear that the study has not considered the capacity of the area in such detail as to be able to conclude that there is "no capacity" for further static caravan/chalet park development or extensions"	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.3.63 states that outside the AONB and SLA a small increase will be allowed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
518	Haulfryn Group Ltd [2986]	7.3.64	Object	<p>Paragraph 7.3.64 refers to no increase in caravan or chalet numbers. A minor increase in the number of units should be permitted when the proposal is part of a scheme to improve the range and quality of tourist accommodation and facilities on the site. Without a minor increase to the number of pitches, it may not be possible to fund the significant investment required to pay for upgrading proposals.</p> <p>Where Holiday Parks are located within the Coastal Change Management Zone (within the AONB), and relocation of pitches are required due to a "rollback" position from the shoreline, a minor increase in the number of pitches should be allowed to assist with funding the re-location of holiday pitches and the significant investment required.</p> <p>POLICY TWR3 paragraph 7.3.64 change to allow a minor increase in units</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Topic Paper 9: Tourism highlighted the high density of Static Caravan and Chalet Parks that exist along on or near the coast, including extensive parts of the AONB.</p> <p>The Isle of Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study was commissioned to manage development such as static caravan and chalet sites by identifying and protecting sensitive and distinct areas from inappropriate development. The primary objective for designating Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty is the conservation and enhancement of their natural beauty therefore they must be afforded the highest status of protection from inappropriate developments. The cumulative impacts of static caravan and chalet developments within the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty can be</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>provided it can be demonstrated that significant site improvements and reduced landscape impact would result</p>	<p>obtrusive in the landscape and damaging to the character of the rural area unless strictly controlled. Special Landscape Areas are non-statutory local designations. Their aim is to ensure that the landscape is not damaged by inappropriate development. The sensitivity and capacity study concluded that within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas (and all areas that contribute to their setting), it is considered that there is typically no capacity for further static caravan/chalet park developments or extensions.</p> <p>A similar approach taken on static and chalet park has been taken in neighbouring authorities and other Local Planning Authorities in Wales.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.3.63 states that outside the AONB and SLA a small increase will be allowed.</p> <p>Agreed that for existing static and chalet parks that are located within the AONB, SLA and Coastal Change Management Zone that a small increase in units will be allowed when supplemented with a business case to justify the increase.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b>            Include following wording to 3iii) Unless, in exceptional circumstances, proposals involve the relocation of existing static and chalet parks that fall within the Coastal Change Management Area.</p> <p>And include following wording to paragraph 7.3.62 "business case / viability"</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>Focussed Change NF54</b>
758	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	7.3.65	Support	Bourne Leisure endorses supporting 7.3.65 as it explains that the purpose of the policy is to promote improvements and upgrade the standard of tourist accommodation alongside reducing the impacts of these sites on the landscape. This approach is in accordance with Bourne Leisure's development aspirations which normally seek to reconfigure/redevelop sites in order to improve the overall quality of the holiday facilities alongside reducing impact on the local environment. This can be done by utilising sensitive landscaping techniques. Endorse the policy aspiration of reducing impact on the landscape as the high quality natural environment is a key attraction for tourists.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
198	Kingsbridge Caravan Park (Mr Andrew Bate) [2778]	7.3.66	Object	<p>Setting a limit of 10% increase in numbers is placing the smaller parks at a disadvantage compared to parks with large numbers of units and gives the large parks an unfair commercial advantage.</p> <p>I would like to see the limit of 10% increase in numbers deleted and have each case considered on its merits. Small parks have particular problems with limited turnover and need an increase in numbers to recover costs associated with raising quality standards and environmental improvements.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Allowing a small increase on existing site aims to promote improvements and upgrade the standard of visitor accommodation on existing sites, and to reduce the impact of these sites on the landscape. Para 7.3.66 states that because of the considerable variety in the size, nature and location of sites, each application will be assessed on its merit within this general guide.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
759	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	7.3.66	Support	Bourne Leisure endorses supporting para 7.3.66 as we consider it sensible to not define the size of the area that can be sought as part of redevelopment proposals. This is because some proposals may require a large site area however this area may be used as a buffer for landscaping purposes which has a positive impact on the local environment. Bourne Leisure also considers that it is sensible to assess each site on its own merit within this general guide. This is because of the wide variety of tourist accommodation in Gwynedd.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

#### TWR4 – Holiday Occupancy

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
97	BH&HPA [2733]	POLICY TWR4	Support	We would wish to register our support to Policy TWR4 as it complies with the aims and objectives of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) and is in accordance with similar development plan policies in neighbouring Local Planning Authorities which support and encourage extended holiday occupancy periods. The Policy is sound and fulfils all of the required tests of soundness.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
224	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY TWR4	Support	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
225	Lafarge Tarmac Trading	POLICY TWR4	Support	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Limited [2735]			of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
613 & 614	Menter Môn (Helen Thomas) [1615] Hunaniaith (Debbie A. Williams Jones) [3037]	POLICY TWR4	Object	<p>There is no economic benefit from extending the holiday season to 12 months which would contribute towards securing sustainable communities.</p> <p>Neither can the Welsh language cope with the negative impact of extending the holiday season. This could mean a substantial increase in the population of some communities, and the little advantage to be had from that is outweighed by the negative effects of such permissions - such as the effect on the linguistic nature of communities, and the pressure on public services.</p> <p>There is a need to reconsider the policy of opening for 12 months.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>National policy guidance supports a year round holiday season. PolicyTWR4 contains robust criteria in order to ensure that the accommodation is being used solely for holiday purposes and does not become the occupant's main or sole place of residence.</p> <p>The plan should not be read in isolation. The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, and maintaining and creating sustainable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
783	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cynghorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY TWR4	Object	There was concern about allowing static caravan/chalet sites to remain open for 12 months a year. There are insufficient resources to be able to monitor the situation and people could live permanently in the units - without paying tax.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> National policy guidance supports a year round holiday season. PolicyTWR4 contains robust criteria in order to ensure that the accommodation is being used solely for holiday purposes and does not become the occupant's main or sole place of residence.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
789	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TWR4	Object	<p>The goal of extending the tourist season is sensible, but presents problems in the caravan sector. Allowing all-year use of static caravans as opposed to the previously established 10.5 month limit makes no difference to their visual impact and responds to established precedents. However, we share concerns that there is insufficient capacity to monitor and enforce genuine holiday use and prevent permanent residential occupancy, contrary to intended policy. The potential economic benefits of 6 weeks of extra use in the low season seem unlikely to justify these risks. On the other hand, policies to limit holiday use of statics to 28 days at a time or 3 months/year also seem to us arbitrary, impractical and unenforceable.</p> <p>Scrap limitations on caravan holiday use as these are unworkable</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> National policy guidance supports a year round holiday season. PolicyTWR4 contains robust criteria in order to ensure that the accommodation is being used solely for holiday purposes and does not become the occupant's main or sole place of residence.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
795	Caravan Club [3039]	POLICY TWR4	Object	In summary the policies relating to tourist accommodating are considered to be overly restrictive and lacking in clarity on the type of development which is acceptable on existing touring caravan sites. The policy should be amended to ensure that the plan does not affect the ability of local tourist businesses from adapting to the changing needs of the visitor economy and does not impact on the future economic viability of these businesses which support local economies, employments and communities.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> National policy guidance supports a year round holiday season. PolicyTWR4 contains robust criteria in order to ensure that the accommodation is being used solely for holiday purposes and does not become the occupant's main or sole place of residence.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1400	Cyng/Counc Alwyn Gruffydd [381]	POLICY TWR4	Object	<p>The view is that extending the holiday season does not contribute substantially to the promotion of sustainable communities, and that the few benefits are outweighed by the negative effects of such permissions, such as the impact on the linguistic nature of communities and the pressure on public services.</p> <p>Need to further consider the policy of opening for 12 months.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> National policy guidance supports a year round holiday season. PolicyTWR4 contains robust criteria in order to ensure that the accommodation is being used solely for holiday purposes and does not become the occupant's main or sole place of residence.</p> <p>The plan should not be read in isolation. The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, and maintaining and creating sustainable</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### TWR5 – Touring Caravan, Camping and Temporary Alternative Camping Accommodation

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
98	BH&HPA [2733]	POLICY TWR5	Object	<p>Whilst draft Policy TWR5 is generally accepted, the imposition of criterion 7 fails to meet the tests of soundness set down for the LDP. There is no planning reason for the imposition of limitation on length of stay and this would unreasonably dictate how a park is operated. The requirement could not be enforced or monitored and is not in accordance with other local planning policies in adjoining areas. It is therefore requested that this element of Policy TWR5 is removed. In order for Policy TWR5 to be 'sound' the accompanying text should be amended. See full submission for detailed changes suggested.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Touring caravan and camping sites, are considered more acceptable in land use planning terms as having less of an impact on the landscape that static caravan and chalet sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local landscape. By allowing the touring caravans to stay on site all year round it could be argued that they would have the same effect, in terms of land use planning, as a new static caravan site</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
199	Kingsbridge Caravan Park	POLICY TWR5	Object	Touring caravan parks should be allowed to store	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	(Mr Andrew Bate) [2778]			<p>caravans for customers provided they are located in unobtrusive areas.</p> <p>This is a key element of the touring park activity and does not appear to be addressed in the policy document. Storage of units has the advantage of reducing disruption on main roads and country lanes and above all reduces vehicle emissions by way of improved fuel economy of the vehicle which would otherwise be towing a caravan.</p>	<p>Touring caravan and camping sites, are considered more acceptable in land use planning terms as having less of an impact on the landscape that static caravan and chalet sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local landscape.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
226	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY TWR5	Support	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
227	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY TWR5	Support	Recreation and tourism uses are viable end uses of previously used land at mineral extraction sites that when restored can provide facilities such as hotel opportunities, camping sites, woodland lodges and caravan parks where appropriate.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
467	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	POLICY TWR5	Object	<p>We object to criteria 3 and 7 of policy TWR 5. Criterion 3 could be amended to read:</p> <p>capable of being removed off the site if the use has been discontinued.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Touring caravan and camping sites, are considered more acceptable in land use planning terms as having less of an impact on the landscape that static caravan and chalet sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local landscape.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
784	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cyngorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY TWR5	Object	<p>Members had noticed an increase in applications and considerable pressure from this type of development in the Llŷn area. We questioned whether there was a basis for the policy and had an analysis been made of the increase in units/the effect of new developments? We believe the policy should be more restrictive within and near the designated area.</p> <p>We believe that priority should be given to monitoring compliance with planning permissions, planning conditions, landscaping conditions and conditions on occupancy.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Touring caravan and camping sites, are considered more acceptable in land use planning terms as having less of an impact on the landscape that static caravan and chalet sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local landscape. The plan recognises that heavily pressured exist in many communities located on or near the coast, including extensive parts of both AONBs. The Councils will require strong evidence that proposals for further units of accommodation in such areas will not add to servicing problems or harm the character or natural resources of these areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
788	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TWR5	Object	<p>We oppose the continuation of a permissive policy for touring caravan sites in the most sensitive landscape areas, in the absence of evidence regarding its impact. We believe the visual impact of tourers, including cumulative impact, is being underestimated and it risks being</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Touring caravan and camping sites, are considered more acceptable in land use planning terms as having less of an impact on the landscape that static caravan and chalet sites because, by their very nature, they have transient</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				as great as that acknowledged for static sites in the past. As a precautionary policy we seek a moratorium on new touring sites within AONBs, SLAs and within 2 km of the coast and some limitation on the size of extensions of existing sites. We support policies for extension of existing sites, provided limits are specified, in exchange for genuine environmental improvements, and provided these are actually monitored and enforced.	<p>features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local landscape. The plan recognises that heavily pressured exist in many communities located on or near the coast, including extensive parts of both AONBs. The Councils will require strong evidence that proposals for further units of accommodation in such areas will not add to servicing problems or harm the character or natural resources of these areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
468	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	7.3.74	Object	The words "When not in use and during the winter months all units should be removed from the site" should be deleted as touring caravans, tents and camping pods can stay on the land "when not in use". Additionally, many touring caravan and alternative camping sites are open during some but not all of the "winter months". The text which requires their removal during winter months therefore has the effect of shortening the holiday season contrary to national policy.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Touring caravan sites have been considered acceptable in land use planning terms as having less impact on the landscape than static caravan sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local environment.</p> <p>National guidance in Technical Advice Note (TAN) 13: Tourism states Authorities should give sympathetic consideration to applications to extend the opening period allowed under existing permissions. A holiday occupancy condition would seem more appropriate than a seasonal occupancy condition where the need is to reduce pressure on local services. Authorities should continue to use seasonal occupancy conditions to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>prevent the permanent residential use of accommodation which, by the character of its construction or design, is unsuitable for continuous occupation especially in the winter months.</p> <p>Caravan and camping sites should be effectively screened, and planned as to not be visually intrusive. Natural screening is less effective during winter months because there is likely to be less natural green screens such as trees and shrubs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
472	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	7.3.75	Object	The extent and acceptability of areas of hard standings can be adequately assessed under Policy TWR 5 without the need to have an effective "embargo" as set out within para. 7.3.75	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Touring caravan sites have been considered acceptable in land use planning terms as having less impact on the landscape than static caravan sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local environment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
470	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	7.3.76	Object	The wording of paragraph 7.3.76 contradicts the aims of Policy TWR5 which is to facilitate the establishment of high quality touring and	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Alternative camping units that have a degree of permanence will be dealt with under policy TWR3.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>camping sites in appropriate locations and recognises the contribution made by high quality touring and camping sites to the range of holiday accommodation available for visitors.</p> <p>The restriction to limit any temporary structures to basic facilities with no drainage or water will inhibit the provision of high quality touring and camping sites. The highest quality alternative camping sites do need to provide water and drainage connections that are now sought by high spend tourists.</p>	<p>Policy TWR5 relates to accommodation that does not impose permanent, year round effects on the local environment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
473	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	7.3.77	Object	<p>Touring or alternative camping units do not become classified as "static" caravans of permanent accommodation simply by virtue of the fact that they may be connected to mains water or drainage. Delete 7.3.77</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Holiday units that are connected to mains drainage and are not capable of being removed when not in use or relocated to another part of the park are not deemed to be transient units and therefore will be dealt with under policy TWR3 of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
475	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	7.3.78	Object	<p>This policy is unduly restrictive and contrary to National Planning Policy as the economic benefits of many forms of alternative camping sites can be extended to periods covering almost 12 months.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Touring caravan sites have been considered acceptable in land use planning terms as having less impact on the landscape than static caravan sites because, by their very nature, they have transient features which do not impose permanent, year round effects on the local environment.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>National guidance in Technical Advice Note (TAN) 13: Tourism states Authorities should give sympathetic consideration to applications to extend the opening period allowed under existing permissions. A holiday occupancy condition would seem more appropriate than a seasonal occupancy condition where the need is to reduce pressure on local services. Authorities should continue to use seasonal occupancy conditions to prevent the permanent residential use of accommodation which, by the character of its construction or design, is unsuitable for continuous occupation especially in the winter months.</p> <p>Caravan and camping sites should be effectively screened, and planned as to not be visually intrusive. Natural screening is less effective during winter months because there is likely to be less natural green screens such as trees and shrubs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> This proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## Town Centres and Retail Developments

### Context and Introduction

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------

112	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	7.3.81	Support	The High Street and the city centre should also be used for dwellings, as well as commerce and entertainment. It should not be permitted to build higher than three storeys when building flats or student halls on sites that are off-campus.	<p><b>Note the supporting comment</b></p> <p>The first bullet point in paragraph 7.3.81 refers to Welsh Government Planning Policy. The Plans policies do not prevent residential use in town centres. The Plan contains separate policies referring to design and integration of new development into their surroundings</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
-----	---------------------------------------------	--------	---------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### PS12 – Town Centre and Retail Developments

Rep Id	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
432	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Support	The map of the Local Plan denotes the town centre incorrectly in our opinion. There are many shops between the station and the Commercial Pub. Many of the town's most important shops are on this part of the High Street, including McColls, one newsagents and one Chinese food shop. These buildings should be kept as shops, in our opinion.	<p><b>Note the supporting comment</b></p> <p>The Blaenau Ffestiniog Map showing the town centre is based on the Retail Study (2013). Policy MAN 3: safeguards shops outside defined town centres unless it can be demonstrated that certain listed criteria can be met.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
606	Menter Iaith Bangor (Mrs Branwen Thomas) [2762]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Support	Menter Iaith Bangor supports Polisi PS12 Town Centres and Retail and point 1- Encourage a varied mixture of suitable uses (as defined in PPW and TAN 4) in high quality environments which attract a broad range of people at different times of day, that are safe and accessible for everyone. There are too many takeaways in the centre of Bangor and a lack of	<p><b>Note the supporting comment</b></p> <p>Policy MAN7 provides criteria that must be satisfied when considering proposals for hot food take-aways including consideration of over concentration.</p> <p>Strategic Policy PS1 seeks to promote and support</p>

				hotels and restaurants. The Initiative would welcome native Welsh businesses that would use the Welsh language and provide a Welsh ethos to the main streets, which are lacking any trace of Welsh language and culture at present.	the use of the Welsh language <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No change</b>
840	Cyngor Dinas Bangor (Mr Gwyn Hughes) [1523]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Object	<p>Policies safeguarding the vitality and viability of Bangor as a Sub-regional Retail Centre and protecting Bangor by restricting expansion of out-of-town and out-of-centre retailing and leisure developments are welcomed. However, potential redevelopment areas should be identified within or close to the town centre so that a retailing or leisure opportunity is not missed. Several sites appear ripe for redevelopment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- South eastern side of High Street between Plas Llwyd and Dean Street Junction, including Plas Llwyd car park.</li> <li>- North western side of the High Street including the Rose and Crown and the White Lion.</li> <li>- University buildings and car park off James Street, rear of Dean Street, including former Octogon building.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Rather than allocate specific sites to meet the estimated additional new convenience and comparison floor space required over the Plan period, the Councils consider that greater flexibility would be achieved by leaving it to market forces to bring suitable sites forward for development or redevelopment. The redevelopment of the sites suggested in the Retail Study (2013) could be facilitated. in line with the Policy MAN1 &amp; Policy MAN3 and national planning policy and guidance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
861	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Support	Policy PS12 is supported (noting sub-regional importance of Bangor)	<p><b>Note the supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1067	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Object	Different hierarchy to retail and housing - what is the rationale for the difference?	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Amend text to provide explanation of the reason for using different hierarchies for retail and</p>

					<p>settlements. The retail hierarchy is based on the different retail roles of the centres and information in the Retail Study (2013). The settlement hierarchy is based on a number of factors including the number, type and scale of existing services within each community. It is explained in greater detail in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Hierarchy</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity the text within the policy will be amended to further explain how the retail hierarchy has been determined.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF: 55</b></p>
1068	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Object	It is unclear where the provision of retail space will be located.	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Rather than allocate specific sites to meet the estimated additional new convenience and comparison floor space required over the Plan period, the JPPU consider that greater flexibility would be achieved by leaving it to market forces to bring suitable sites forward for development or redevelopment.</p> <p>in line with Policy MAN1 &amp; Policy MAN3 and national planning policy and guidance. Nonetheless it is considered that the Plan's wording should be amended to show the findings of the Retail Study, which set out how the overall requirement for additional floor space should be delivered on a settlement by settlement basis.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend Policy and text to state which retail centres</p>

					are expected to provide additional retail space over the Plan period
					<b>Focussed Change NF: 56</b>
1172	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Object	<p>Horizon is concerned that Criterion 6 "restricting the expansion of out-of-centre retailing and leisure development" could unduly restrict the development of leisure facilities at temporary worker accommodation sites.</p> <p>Rather than seek for specific amendments to this policy, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed above which would be the relevant policies against which to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion to its associated development from this policy.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Policy PS12 accords with national retail and town centre policy guidance set out in Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7) 2014 and TAN4 (1996).</p> <p>It isn't considered necessary to include detailed policies within the plan relating specifically to developments associated with Wylfa Newydd, there are other relevant policies within the Plan which will have to be applied when considering associated development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

#### MAN1 – Proposed Town Centre Developments

Rep Id	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
112	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	7.3.81	Support	The High Street and the city centre should also be used for dwellings, as well as commerce and entertainment. It should not be permitted to build higher than three storeys when building flats or student halls on sites that are off-campus.	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>The first bullet point in paragraph 7.3.81 refers to Welsh Government Planning Policy. The Plans policies do not prevent residential use in town centres. The Plan contains separate policies referring to design and integration of new development into their surroundings</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



					<b>No change</b>
432	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Support	The map of the Local Plan denotes the town centre incorrectly in our opinion. There are many shops between the station and the Commercial Pub. Many of the town's most important shops are on this part of the High Street, including McColls, one newsagents and one Chinese food shop. These buildings should be kept as shops, in our opinion.	<b>Noted</b>  The Blaenau Ffestiniog Map showing the town centre is based on the Retail Study (2013). Policy MAN 3: safeguards shops outside defined town centres unless it can be demonstrated that certain listed criteria can be met.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
606	Menter Iaith Bangor (Mrs Branwen Thomas) [2762]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Support	Menter Iaith Bangor supports Polisi PS12 Town Centres and Retail and point 1- Encourage a varied mixture of suitable uses (as defined in PPW and TAN 4) in high quality environments which attract a broad range of people at different times of day, that are safe and accessible for everyone. There are too many takeaways in the centre of Bangor and a lack of hotels and restaurants. The Initiative would welcome native Welsh businesses that would use the Welsh language and provide a Welsh ethos to the main streets, which are lacking any trace of Welsh language and culture at present.	<b>Noted</b>  Policy MAN7 provides criteria that must be satisfied when considering proposals for hot food take-aways including consideration of over concentration.  Strategic Policy PS1 seeks to promote and support the use of the Welsh language  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
840	Cyngor Dinas Bangor (Mr Gwyn Hughes) [1523]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Object	Policies safeguarding the vitality and viability of Bangor as a Sub-regional Retail Centre and protecting Bangor by restricting expansion of out-of-town and out-of-centre retailing and leisure developments are welcomed. However, potential redevelopment areas should be identified within or close to the town centre so that a retailing or leisure opportunity is not missed. Several sites appear ripe for redevelopment: - South eastern side of High Street between Plas	<b>Not accepted</b>  Rather than allocate specific sites to meet the estimated additional new convenience and comparison floor space required over the Plan period, the JPPU consider that greater flexibility would be achieved by leaving it to market forces to bring suitable sites forward for development or redevelopment.

				Llwyd and Dean Street Junction, including Plas Llwyd car park. - North western side of the High Street including the Rose and Crown and the White Lion. - University buildings and car park off James Street, rear of Dean Street, including former Octogon building.	in line with Policy MAN1 & Policy MAN3 and national planning policy and guidance.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
861	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Support	Policy PS12 is supported (noting sub-regional importance of Bangor)	<b>Noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
1067	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Object	Different hierarchy to retail and housing - what is the rationale for the difference?	<b>Accepted</b>  Amend text to provide explanation of the reason for using different hierarchies for retail and settlements. The retail hierarchy is based on the different retail roles of the centres and information in the Retail Study (2013). The settlement hierarchy is based on a number of factors including the number, type and scale of existing services within each community. It is explained in greater detail in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Hierarchy  <b>Recommendation</b>  Amend policy and text in order to provide clarity  <b>Focussed Change NF: 55</b>
1068	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Object	It is unclear where the provision of retail space will be located.	<b>Accepted in part</b>

					<p>Rather than allocate specific sites to meet the estimated additional new convenience and comparison floor space required over the Plan period, the JPPU consider that greater flexibility would be achieved by leaving it to market forces to bring suitable sites forward for development or redevelopment.</p> <p>in line with Policy MAN1 &amp; Policy MAN3 and national planning policy and guidance.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>Focussed change NF:56 and NF57</b></p>
1172	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS12	Object	<p>Horizon is concerned that Criterion 6 "restricting the expansion of out-of-centre retailing and leisure development" could unduly restrict the development of leisure facilities at temporary worker accommodation sites.</p> <p>Rather than seek for specific amendments to this policy, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed above which would be the relevant policies against which to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion to its associated development from this policy.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Policy PS12 accords with national retail and town centre policy guidance set out in Planning Policy Wales (Edition 8) 2016 and TAN4 (1996)</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

536	Cyngor Tref Biwmares (Prof TW Ashenden) [1267]	POLICY MAN1	Object	The Town Centre of Beaumaris marked on this map does not properly represent the actual town centre area of the town. It is important that these areas are correctly identified in the Deposit Plan so that Beaumaris's position as a local service centre and important tourism destination can be secured by the plan.	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The Town Centre Map of Beaumaris is based on the Retail Study (2013). Policy MAN 3: safeguards shops outside defined town centres unless it can be demonstrated that certain listed criteria can be met.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
-----	------------------------------------------------------	-------------	--------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### MAN2 – Primary Retail Areas (Retail Core)

Rep ID	Person/ Organisation	Section	Support / Object	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Councils' Response
1392	Cyng/Counc RH Wyn Williams [367]	POLICY MAN2	Object	<p>I would like you to consider the following regarding Abersoch, because the plan is for a period of 10 years or more:-</p> <p>Request for increase in shopping area boundary, because by now there are many businesses the length of Lôn Engan and therefore there will be need for a small increase in new development in line with demand and the busyness of Abersoch as a local tourist resort over the next 10 years .</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The Town Centre Map of Abersoch is based on the Retail Study (2013). Policy MAN 3: safeguards shops outside defined town centres unless it can be demonstrated that certain listed criteria can be met.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the</p>

					Plan's soundness. <b>No change</b>
1393	Cyng/Counc RH Wyn Williams [367]	POLICY MAN2	Object	I would like you to consider the following regarding Abersoch, because the plan is for a period of 10 years or more:-  The bounded area should be identified as a Commercial Area to promote work in the tourism industry and benefit the economy.	<b>Not accepted</b>  The Town Centre Map of Abersoch is based on the Retail Study (2013). Policy MAN 3: safeguards shops outside defined town centres unless it can be demonstrated that certain listed criteria can be met.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No change</b>

**MAN3 – No Comments**

**MAN4 – No Comments**

**MAN5 – New Retailing in Villages**

Rep ID	Person/ Organisation	Section	Support / Object	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Councils' Response
612	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	POLICY MAN5	Object	Considered that Borth-y- Gest would benefit from a retail outlet since there is no shop in the village. It is considered that Criteria 5 of MAN5 is unnecessary restrictive especially at a time when Gwynedd Council has announced that it is to introduce parking charges on the nearest off-street parking.	<b>Not accepted</b>  The Polisi is based on the Retail Study (2013). Policy MAN 3: safeguards shops outside defined town centres unless it can be demonstrated that certain listed criteria can be met.

				<p>Suggested Change</p> <p>Amend criteria 5 of MAN5 new retailing in village (parking arrangements to permit change of use of existing premises to retail premises without any parking constraints being necessary)</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

#### MAN6 – Retailing in the Countryside

Rep ID	Person/ Organisation	Section	Support / Object	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Councils' Response
1175	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY MAN6	Object	<p>It is not clear whether this policy would apply to any retail development included within temporary worker accommodation sites. Rather than seek for specific amendments to this policy, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed above which would be the relevant policies against which to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion to its associated development from this policy.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Policy MAN6 accords with national retail and town centre policy guidance set out in Planning Policy Wales (Edition 8) 2016 and TAN4 (1996)</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It isn't considered necessary to include detailed policies within the plan relating specifically to developments associated with Wylfa Newydd, there are other relevant policies within the Plan which will have to be applied when considering associated development.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

**MAN7 – Hot Food Take-Away Uses**

Rep ID	Person/ Organisation	Section	Support / Object	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Councils' Response
831	Cyngor Dinas Bangor (Mr Gwyn Hughes) [1523]	POLICY MAN7	Object	<p>The Council is of the opinion that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A 10% limit should be imposed on the provision of hot food takeaways in the two areas where the saturation point has already been reached- the bottom of Bangor High Street below the Dean Street junction and Holyhead Road in Upper Bangor.</li> <li>- Hot food takeaways should not be permitted in the designated prime retail area in the town centre as they create litter, refuse and anti-social behaviour problems which could detrimentally affect the character of the centre.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

## CHAPTER 7.4 SUPPLY AND QUALITY OF HOUSING

### Scale and Type of Housing

#### PS13 – Housing Provision

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
313	Cyfeillion LLyn (Mrs Sian Parri) [2871]	7.4.1	Object	Too many houses for Pwllheli and Botwnnog, the allocation should be distributed through the area's villages which are served by the high school and the surgery, located in Botwnnog.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
755	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	7.4.1	Support	<p>In the third bullet point it states "Planning Authorities, in partnership with the community must ...develop policies to satisfy the challenges and the unique circumstances that are present in specific locations within their areas."</p> <p>We welcome the observation in the above statement, namely "in</p>	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				partnership with the community" and we hope that everyone follows this guideline.	
280	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	7.4.2	Object	<p>The Government's housing objectives</p> <p>The housing objectives of the County should be prioritised</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
752	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J	7.4.2	Object	<p>It is stated "... the Government's housing aims".</p> <p>Do the aims of the Government</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Roberts) [1550]			<p>correspond with the local aims? Shouldn't it be the local aims that control any development? How rigid are the Government's housing aims?</p> <p>There is a need for information regarding the statutory nature of the Government's housing aims.</p>	<p>line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
282	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	7.4.3	Object	<p>HBF require clarification if the comments about the market conditions are based on local conditions. HBF would note that in the wider Wales and UK things are more positive. The latest figures from HBF show a 49% increase in residential properties being approved in Wales in 2014. An NHBC Jan 15 figures show a 12% increase in completions in Wales in 2014. Help to</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> – the annual Housing Land Studies for both LPAs continue to show that the number of housing units being built in the area is relatively low and it is anticipated that this will continue for a period. An analysis of diverse evidence shows that a number of households in the area are also struggling to get a mortgage or to rent housing. This is noted in Topic Paper 3 Population and Housing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				Buy has helped over 1300 people buy homes in Wales in the last year.	There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
751	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	7.4.6	Object	It is stated here that "... being a house owner is only an option for those on high incomes and for those with equity from other sources, such as from family members or from inheritance".  The 'Llanystumdwy Community Council Area Housing Needs Survey Report' shows that children continue to live at home and that 61.4% cannot even purchase an affordable house.  The Deposit Plan should reflect local needs.	<b>Comment noted</b> - Topic Paper 3 Population and Housing, for example, notes the position as regards market housing in the Plan area. We refer to a range of policies in the Deposit Plan that will promote a mix of housing types.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
749	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	7.4.7	Support	We agree with the observation made in this paragraph. There is space for similar developments but on a smaller scale in rural villages also.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
86	Y Mg. Carl Iwan Clowes [2728]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	The number of homes that the Councils consider necessary to meet the needs of the Plan area, over the Plan period 2011 - 2026. What is the evidence that population projections	<b>Partially accepted</b> - The Plan promotes a relatively small growth up to 2018 because the local economy is still weak. The Plan will be monitored annually and will be reviewed after four years, unless the monitoring indicates the need for an earlier review. The monitoring and review work will

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>(natural growth) over the period justifies this amount of housing? The influx which will occur in light of this suggestion is too much for our communities; much less housing is needed, as well as organic vegetation to coincide with the economy's gradual growth.</p> <p>I would like to see two options. i) should Wylfa B proceed ii) if the plan is approved and Wylfa B does not proceed, what happens next - empty housing that will be filled by whom??</p>	<p>record if Wylfa Newydd happens or not. If Wylfa Newydd is not built during the Plan period, the Council will need to demonstrate through the review how it will deal with that situation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>In order to improve clarity, it is believed that a change to create a link between Policy PS13 and the Policy Monitoring Framework in Chapter 8 of the Plan would better explain the situation.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF60, NF61</b></p>
130	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>Object to the reduction in the housing provision from 7,665 as identified in the Preferred Strategy. The document contains no explanation of why this has happened. Do not understand why the number of units have been split into two year periods as there is no phasing policy to support this split(although it is suggested in D26 of the monitoring plan). The plan itself can't maintain a 5 year land supply as stated in the third sentence this is controlled by market forces.</p> <p>Explain why figure has been reduced.</p>	<p><b>Partially accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics "Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results" (2014), "Explaining the difference between Welsh Government's 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd" (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>As a minimum increase the Housing provision figure to 7471 and identified opportunities to 8189. Remove the split of housing between the two year periods, The policy refers to it as a target yet the monitoring section at theme 4 D26 seems to indicate it is a phasing constraint. The third sentence should be reworded.</p>	<p>migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The analysis of the evidence suggests that the impact of the recent economic downturn is likely to continue to have an effect during the first years of the Plan. The lack of funding for developers and the availability of mortgages for prospective homeowners are likely to prohibit/ restrict the housing developments being built. The housing strategy is clear that it is not possible to address the total number of houses without a clear understanding of the viability issues in the area at present. It is therefore anticipated that the number of housing units built will be relatively low during the first years of the Plan, up to 2018, before we see an improvement to the average level of housing units per annum being built during the remaining period of the Plan. Realizing the Wylfa Newydd Project and significant developments will trigger the recovery. Phased implementation of the Plan also depends on the financial position nationally and internationally. The annual monitoring work will check: are houses being built at a faster or slower rate than anticipated? is the development</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>pattern as anticipated? If the answers are different, then there will be necessary to consider what that means to the Plan area or sub-area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>In order to improve clarity and internal consistency of the Plan it is believed that there is a basis for adding to paragraphs 7.4.2 - 7.4.4 in order to show how a two-stage construction period was identified in Policy PS13, and to refer to the importance of the annual monitoring.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF59, NF60</b></p>
368	Mr Dave Eccles [269]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>The current housing requirements are based on figures which are now 4 years old. Population figures appear have shown a decline overall since 2000.</p> <p>Oversupply would be as damaging to as undersupply in an area so dependent on tourism. Property prices would drop in the former instance, encouraging more 'second home' buyers and/or an increasing aging population. In the latter instance younger people on relatively lower incomes would find it difficult to buy their own homes as prices increase.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
447	WYG/Alliance Planning (Mr Mark Walton) [2905]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>The proposed 10% slippage allowance in housing growth is insufficient to take full account of potential barriers to the delivery of housing site in the Joint Authorities Area either by developers bringing sites forward or potential buyers securing funding. More flexibility in terms of the location and choice of available housing sites (allocations) should be provided in the LDP.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The position of other planning authorities across Wales was studied. In general it was found that 10% was used by many of them in order to provide flexibility in the supply of land available for addressing the demand for new housing units. It would be unreasonable not to include slippage allowance because to do so would suggest that all sites everywhere would produce just 30 units per hectare. It was also found that the Welsh Government is supportive in principle to this type of level. We also looked at past patterns of sites in the area with planning permission where these were not realized, and where planning permission will not be renewed. The number of housing units built will be the subject of ongoing monitoring and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>will feed into the Annual Housing Land Study and Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
647	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Support	We support the proposed level of housing provision, allocations to an affordable category, and the broad balanced housing allocation policy.	<p><b>Supportive comment noted.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
657	Robert Llewelyn Jones [3058]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>I am asking for a plan to include the terraced houses in Holyhead and elsewhere on the island. Plan should be in place to enable them to be updated and to try to improve our present private housing stock. Cities such as Liverpool are in the process of modernising their centres of population, it is time for us to do the same.</p> <p>Include a radical plan looking at the future for our large stock of terraced</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				houses and working out a plan of action to see them becoming an integral part of our modern housing stock.	<p>the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>Noted the comment about making effective use of the existing housing stock. However, although bringing back houses that have been empty for some time would contribute to reducing the demand for new housing units, ensuring that existing homes will be upgraded is beyond the remit of the Plan.</p> <p>Plans related to the Holyhead Regeneration Area will be able to promote opportunities that will achieve the objectives to regenerate Holyhead.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
813	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Support	PS13 proposes to provide for land for 7902 new housing units over the period 2011-2026 in Ynys Môn and Gwynedd combined (of which 4084 are in Gwynedd and 3817 in Ynys Môn). Of these 468 have already been completed, another 1476 already have planning permission, leaving a net additional need of 2140 in Gwynedd. This represents 3.5% (7% gross) of the existing (2011 census) Gwynedd housing stock. The number compares with 4178 units (3187 net of consented sites) provided for in the GUDP for the period 2001-2016. We support the JLDP housing provision proposal and see no reason to dispute it. We also support 15-20% of housing being allocated to an 'affordable' category.	<p><b>Supportive comment noted.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
816	Cyngor Cymuned Tudweiliog (Mrs Glenys Peters) [1236]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	Housing should be built in line with the need	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics "Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results" (2014), "Explaining the difference between Welsh Government's 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd" (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan,</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
817	Cyngor Tref Pwllheli (Mr Robin W Hughes) [1235]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	The housing provision is not supported as it is too high and will have a detrimental impact on the Welsh language. Reduce the number of housing to reflect the local population.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
818	Cyngor Gwynedd (Cyng/Counc Ann Williams) [355]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>Generally I do not believe that there has been sufficient study of the impact of building so many houses on the Welsh language, in the whole of Gwynedd, or in the individual communities. When talking about Bethesda, it is noted that inward migration is not a significant problem in the area, but it does not note on what basis, or by following what research, this is said. I would be more satisfied if the necessary research was undertaken on the effect that building a substantial number of new houses will have on the language in all parts of the two counties.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
821	Jina Gwyrfai [3092]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	There is no need for 7,902 new houses. Not enough consideration is being given to the existing housing stock. There are too many empty	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions,</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>houses (1,078) in the two counties and a very high percentage of holiday homes. This stock should be looked at and compulsory purchases made before adapting them and renting them for a fair price to local people who are not able to afford any houses at all in their own areas. The population growth does not warrant 8,000. What about the houses on the market that aren't selling? Need to reject the figures and implement firm policies to bring empty houses back into use, to charge a tax on second homes to fund enough rented housing for local people in their communities.</p>	<p>Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The comment about empty houses is noted. Consideration has been given to the existence of empty houses when converting the household figure to a demand for housing figure and when considering how to address the demand for new housing units.</p> <p>The comment about holiday homes is noted. However, it beyond the remit of the Plan to raise rates on this type of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>housing and to use the funds.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
839	Menter Iaith Bangor (Mrs Branwen Thomas) [2762]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>Robust research must be undertaken that relates specifically to Bangor to ascertain the actual need for housing in the city. We believe very strongly that Bangor's role is not to provide a dormitory suburb for workers from north-east Wales and north-west England. Publishing a final version of the Development Plan that is based on this will be harmful to Bangor's Welsh identity and will undermine the Welsh language.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
869	Hughes Bros Ltd - [3083]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	The balance that is struck between the housing requirement arising within	<b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>the plan area, environmental constraints and landscape capacity within Policy PS13 will result in a shortfall in new housing. This is highly significant given the need for open market housing, the provision of affordable housing and it will also limit flexibility to cater for different types of residential accommodation, for example housing for older and retired people.</p> <p>In addition, the 10% allowance for slippage is too low to ensure that housing needs are met.</p>	<p>evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The types of housing units on sites and layout/design of the sites are issues that will be discussed at the planning application stage. This does not prohibit development for the elderly or other community groups. Policy TAI 1 promotes a mix of housing types and Policy TAI 14 refers to residential homes, extra care homes or additional care</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>homes for the elderly.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
870	Hughes Bros Ltd - [3083]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	The 10% allowance for slippage is too low to ensure that housing needs are met.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – It would be unreasonable not to include slippage allowance because to do so would suggest that all sites everywhere would produce exactly 30 units per hectare.</p> <p>As regards identifying the slippage allowance in the Plan, the position of other planning authorities in Wales was looked at. It was found that 10% was used by many of them. It was also found that the Welsh Government is supportive in principle to this type of level. We also looked at past patterns of sites in the area with planning permission where these were not realized. The number of housing units built will be the subject of ongoing monitoring and will feed into the Annual Housing Land Study and Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
903	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>It isn't clear what consideration has been made on the impact that Wylfa Newydd through the extended construction period would have on the needs for housing in the Plan area. We object to the splitting of the housing requirement to two periods, which would equate to 372 homes per year initially and a doubling to 662 homes per year afterwards. The Plan should simply provide for an annualised requirement of 478 homes over the plan period. This prevents the back loading of the housing requirement and allow the necessary time for applications to be prepared and submitted and permission obtained in order to increase build rates.</p>	<p><b>Partially accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>However the objector has drawn attention to the need to explain when it is expected that the housing units will be provided.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add to paragraphs 7.4.2 to 7.4.4 to explain what the likely housing trajectory will be, to provide a link to the annual monitoring framework and the relevant Topic Papers.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF59, NF60</b></p>
959	Cylch yr Iaith (Ieuan Wyn) [3128]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	The comments submitted by us in our document relate to housing growth, distribution and allocations, and address the impact of the Deposit Plan on the Welsh Language. The comments draw attention to the deficiencies in the language impact assessments and other documents relating to the Welsh language, and refer to the lack of evidence as well as unreliable evidence. The total numbers of housing growth for both counties and the growth distribution and the allocations within them should be reviewed. The review should be based on evidence deriving from studies of the following key factors: community need for housing, current housing stock, housing affordability, houses for sale/rent, 2011 Census data, a new language impact assessment in line with socio-linguistic principles.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing</p>
960	Canolfan Hanes Uwchgwyrfai (Geraint Jones) [3130]				
972	Dyfodol i'r Iaith (Dr Simon Brooks) [3136]				
973	Cymdeithas yr Iaith (Dr Menna Machreth) [3138]				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p>In spatial terms, the Plan seeks to ensure that new development is distributed to reflect the relative ability of settlements to cope with the growth, taking into account their sustainability qualifications in terms of accessibility, availability of facilities and services, as well as size, population and location of the settlement. We refer to Topic Paper 5 which records the qualifications of individual settlements. The strategy and the settlement hierarchy reflect the sustainability objectives underpinning the Plan. It is believed that the current distribution of growth is appropriate to ensure that development is suitable and reflects the ability of settlements to cope with the level of growth that can be realized.</p> <p>Except for T4 (Bangor) and T58 (Bethel) allocations, the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>allocations in the Deposit Plan are robust and can be realized. They were put together having addressed the methodology of assessing sites (Topic Paper 1 and Paper Topic 1A) and are consistent with the Sustainability Assessment (which includes the SEA).</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Although there was no compelling evidence to justify a change to the total number of houses in the Plan, it is believed that there are grounds to make some focussed changes to better highlight how the Plan will help to promote development in the interests of the Welsh language. Note also the contents of background documents relevant to the Welsh language.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF10, NF14, NF15, NF16, NF19, NF21, NF44, NF49, NF50, NF58, NF62</b></p>
974	Cyng./Counc. Alwyn Gruffydd [381]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	As the plan notes, policy PS13 is crucial for maintaining and creating safe, healthy, distinctive and vibrant communities. However, the key to acting on this aim is the vitality of local communities. Housing developments should follow vitality and growth rather than creating space to be filled which, like uncontrolled immigration, militates against this objective.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
977	Pwyllgor Ymchwil Cymunedau Cymraeg a Chymreig Mon (Robyn Parri) [3141]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>Concern is raised regarding six elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* «The Coalition Government's Regional Economic Development Strategy 'One Wales' - will lead to the 'Galway-isation' of the most Welsh part of Welsh-speaking Anglesey and the uplands of North Arfon;</li> <li>* The construction of a second generation of nuclear reactors on Anglesey will again stimulate the demand for additional housing beyond any real local demand;«</li> <li>* Does not respond to local proven scientific 'demand';«</li> <li>* The absence of any Scientific Measure of the Socio-linguistic Impact and the Demography of Economic and Planning Developments on our Welsh language communities;«</li> <li>* The absence of a linguistic community and economic planning policy. «</li> </ul> <p>An economic, social, linguistic and demographic assessment should be held on the real local land development and housing needs of</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				Anglesey and the Menai Straits area on the basis of two assumptions, namely that there will be a new reactor, or that there will be no new reactor.	<p>formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
985	Grwp Ffocws Cynllun Datblygu Lleol (Mr Iwan Edgar) [3050]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	The number of units proposed is excessive compared to local need and is likely to cause immigration which could be detrimental to the Welsh language in its stronghold. Reduce the proposed number of houses in both Counties.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Although there was no compelling evidence to justify a change to the total number of houses in the Plan, it is believed that there are grounds to make some focussed</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>changes to better highlight how the Plan will help to promote development in the interests of the Welsh language. Note also the contents of background documents relevant to the Welsh language.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF10, NF14, NF15, NF16, NF19, NF21, NF44, NF49, NF50, NF58, NF62</b></p>
1062	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>Further clarity is required to illustrate how the identified targets will be used to maintain a 5 year land supply of housing land. The LPAs should demonstrate that they can provide a 5 year housing supply from the plans adoption, in accordance with Planning Policy Wales, paragraph 9.2.3.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> - there are general complications associated with land development and building houses that are beyond the remit of the local development plan, e.g. the state of the local and national economy. This means that it is impossible to be absolutely certain about how the Plan will succeed. It is not reasonable to expect to see an equal annual or spatial distribution. It is very likely that the area will continue to see low periods and high periods of housing construction. An analysis of the evidence indicates that there has been a low period in terms of housing construction since the beginning of the Plan, and this is likely to continue for a while. Reports for the Housing Land Studies since 2011 note this.</p> <p>The sites identified in the Deposit Plan have been assessed and it is believed that they will provide a range and choice of sites that can be developed in accordance with the spatial strategy plan. This assessment work has included consulting with various officers in both Councils and statutory advisors to identify constraints/ issues that need to be tackled. Paper Topic 1A provides an overview of these assessments. The best information available was used to estimate the number of housing units that are</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>likely to be built per year up to 2026. Paragraphs 7.4.2 to 7.4.4 require amendment to provide the relevant information by cross-referencing a new topic paper that will be available for the public consultation period about the focussed changes.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend paragraphs 7.4.2 to 7.4.4 to refer to the housing development trajectory and to the additional Topic Paper as well as a new policy about phased development and use of conditions to manage delivery of sites.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF59, NF60, NF62</b></p>
1063	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	It is unclear how the proposed phasing of housing development has been derived and how it will be delivered over the plan period. It is noted that the plan has linked its phasing to the development of Wylfa B, however further clarification in relation to specific sites, and deliverability of those sites is required. The authorities will need to control and monitor the housing provision to ensure they achieve the proposed build rates and overall housing requirements (see also monitoring framework)	<p><b>Accepted</b> - see the response to objection no. 1062.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend paragraphs 7.4.2 to 7.4.4 to refer to the housing development trajectory and to the additional Topic Paper.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF59, NF60</b></p> <p>In order to improve the clarity of the Plan.</p>
1276	Cyngor Cymuned	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	We object to the proposal to limit the maximum to two units per cluster for	<b>Not accepted</b> - in order to distribute the growth level of the Plan, a growth estimate must be given for the Clusters

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Llandderfel (Mrs Bethan Jones) [1257]			<p>the life of the Plan. It would be better to permit units according to demand and permit the number of affordable housing units as required for local people. There should also be the ability to extend the boundary as required to ensure there are sites for local people on their own land.</p> <p>Change: Allow houses to be erected according to demand and not limit it to two units for the life of the Plan. Extend the boundary when required to ensure that local people are able to erect dwellings on their own land.</p>	<p>tier, which is 2 units in each Cluster.</p> <p>The Plan's annual monitoring system will enable us to review what is happening within this tier. There might be a greater need within some clusters than others, and dependent upon appropriate evidence to justify this need, a higher level of growth beyond 2 units might be supported in some Clusters.</p> <p>However, if the annual monitoring work shows that the level is considerably higher within the overall Clusters tier, this could lead to a review of the Plan's Housing Distribution.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1408	Admiral Taverns [3348]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>The proposed slippage allowance in housing growth is insufficient to take account of potential barriers to the delivery of housing site in the Joint Authorities Areas by potential developers bringing sites forward. More flexibility in terms of the location and choice of available housing sites (allocations) should be</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – It would be unreasonable not to include slippage allowance because to do so would suggest that all sites everywhere would produce exactly 30 units per hectare.</p> <p>As regards identifying the slippage allowance in the Plan, the position of other planning authorities in Wales was looked at. It was found that 10% was used by many of them. It was also found that the Welsh Government is</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>provided in the LDP. The policy is therefore, unsound as it is unable to respond quickly to changing circumstances.</p> <p>Slippage allowance should be increased to at least 15% preferable 20% to provide greater flexibility and choice of housing sites.</p>	<p>supportive in principle to this type of level. We also looked at past patterns of sites in the area with planning permission where these were not realized. The number of housing units built will be the subject of ongoing monitoring and will feed into the Annual Housing Land Study and Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1428	Marian Elias Roberts [3353]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>The 7,902 is inappropriate as it is based on national population projections including migration, rather than on a community need for housing. There is no robust evidence held by both councils to show that there is a direct link between the number of housing and community need. This is a fundamental flaw and it should be corrected before moving forward. I am also of the opinion that both councils haven't shown that these developments will not damage the position of the Welsh language in communities. In-migration had had and continues to have a consumptive effect on the Welsh language in the</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics "Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results" (2014), "Explaining the difference between Welsh Government's 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd" (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				area's towns and villages. The Language Impact Assessment includes sweeping statements without dependable evidence.	<p>factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1452	Cymdeithas yr Iaith (Mr Dylan	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	We do not accept the Deposit Plan in its current form at all. We don't consider that there is robust evidence:	<b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics "Gwynedd &



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Morgan) [2730]			<p>* That there is a community need for the number of houses put forward;</p> <p>* That the housing development will not damage the Welsh language's position in communities.</p> <p>We believe that:</p> <p>* The condition of the Welsh language is of no importance to you;</p> <p>* It doesn't acknowledge the period's complex economic conditions, only the old lazy assumptions in support of economic growth.</p> <p>Because it is Wylfa Newydd with the influx of thousands of construction workers from outside the Plan area, which will require accommodation or a home, that drives the Plan, purporting that this project could be of any benefit to the future of Welsh within communities in Anglesey and Gwynedd is deceitful. You should start from the beginning again by conducting detailed language studies of every community in Anglesey.</p>	<p>Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1453	Dyffryn Nantlle 2020 (Ben Gregory) [3355]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>Evidence about population shows that the growth will come from outside the area, with a negative effect on the language. The mitigating measures in the Strategic Policy aren't implemented in Gwynedd now and there is no framework to do so in the future. In Penygroes there is no evidence to show the need for 89 houses - the existing evidence suggests 25 units in 10 years. There is no evidence in the WLIA to support the conclusion that Penygroes can cope with negative effects. Therefore, reduce the number in Penygroes to 30 and in the Plan area the figure should be based on local need.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics "Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results" (2014), "Explaining the difference between Welsh Government's 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd" (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No change</b>
1460	Mr Alex Badley [255]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>We object to Policy PS13 on the grounds that the housing requirement places too much emphasis on the 2011 Household projections and environmental capacity issues. As such the figure originally included in the Preferred Strategy, i.e. 7,665 together with a further 10% slippage allowance, should be reinstated as a minimum requirement. To meet the 5 year residual requirement (5 x 479), 2,395 dwellings should be identified as a minimum, in the period 2014 to 2018. This is in addition to the 917 completed 2011-14 in both authority areas</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
1706	Eirwen Williams [3094]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	<p>I am very concerned about what is proposed in the Local Development Plan for the counties of Gwynedd and Anglesey, and the implications of this for the Welsh-speaking communities of both counties.</p> <p>The plan seeks to release land in order to build nearly 8000 housing units. I strongly believe that this figure is incorrect. The Plan should be based on the housing needs of the local population. The work undertaken is insufficient to measure what exactly the housing needs of the local residents in both counties are, and what exactly the implications of implementing the Plan would be on the future of our fragile Welsh-speaking communities.</p> <p>There is a moral duty on the Councils to do everything in their powers to place the Welsh language and the future of Welsh-speaking communities at the heart of the Plan and I strongly believe that this has not happened in the process of creating the Plan.</p> <p>Both Councils need to listen to the</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 4A, which is based on information gathered from several sources, such as the evidence prepared by Edge Analytics “Gwynedd &amp; Anglesey Population &amp; Household Forecasts, Assumptions, Methodology &amp; Scenario Results” (2014), “Explaining the difference between Welsh Government’s 2008- and 2011-based projections for Gwynedd” (2014), provide information on the issues and justification for the level of housing growth in the Plan area. In order to assess and identify the demand for new homes in the Plan, consideration was given in the first instance to the population and housing forecasts of the Welsh Government for the area of the two Councils, in line with the expectations of Planning Policy Wales (9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in</p>
1708	Bedwyr Owen (3177)				
1709	Deian Ap Rhisiart (3197)				
1710	Adam Jones (3198)				
1711	Alan Tangi (3224)				
1712	Wyn Williams (3241)				
1713	Dafydd Bates (3267)				
1714	Geraint Parri (3271)				
	Mrs Joanna				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1715	Thomas (2643)	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13	Object	democratic voice of the people in the consultation process and act accordingly.	<p>formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be paid to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1716	Angharad Hughes (3114)				
1717	Ifan Webb (3166)				
1718	Gareth Lloyd Jones [3171]				
1719	Meirion Williams [3178]				
1720	Angharad Griffiths [3199]				
1721	Angharad Blythe [3200]				
1721	Sioned Haf [3201]				
1721	Osian Elias [3203]				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1722	Bethan Roberts [3204]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13			
1723	Randal Isaac [3207]				
1724	Deiniol Carter (3208)				
1725	Gwawr Edwards (3209)				
1726	Idwal Williams (3215)				
1727	Trefor Jones - Morris [3216]				
	Robert James [3218]				
1728	Eleri Jenkins-Edwards [3219]				
	Gwen Gruffudd				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1729	[3223]				
1730	Lleuwen Steffan [3225]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13			
1731	Gwilym John [3226]				
1732	John Williams [3239]				
1732	Elwyn Jones [3240]				
1733	Euros ap Hywel [3242]				
1733	Meinir Jones [3243]				
1734	Eirian Jones [3245]				
1735	Gwenno Griffith [3249]				
1736	Cai O'Marah [3254]				
	Sian Northey				



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1737	[3256] Angharad Elias [3263]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13			
1738	Anna George [3264]				
1739	Dafydd Orritt [3268]				
1740	Dilys Roberts [3269]				
1741	Elin Wynne [3270]				
1742	John Trefor Jones [3274]				
1743	Llinos Griffin [3276] Mair Huws Jones [3277]				
1744	Morwenna Williams [3278]				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1745	Olwen Jones [3279]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13			
1746	Osian Eryl [3280]				
1747	Jina Gwyrfai [3092]				
1748	Cymdeithas yr Iaith (Mr Dylan Morgan) [2730]				
1749	Elwyn Williams [3095]				
1750	Llinos Parri [3170]				
1751	Sion Jones [3172]				
1752	Dylan Llyr [3173]				
	Aled Powell				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1753	[3174]				
	Rhian Green [3175]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13			
1754					
1755	Daniel Williams [3176]				
	Carl Morris [3179]				
	John Hughes [3202]				
1756					
	Annis Milner [3205]				
1757	Lowri Ifan [3206]				
	Bedwyr a Robert Griffiths [3210]				
1758					
1759	Eleri Davies [3211]				
	Seimon				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1760	Morris [3213]				
1761	Hedd Gwynfor [3214]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13			
1762	Medwen Brookes [3217]				
1763	Mared Roberts [3222]				
1764	Eiri Sion [3227]				
1765	Hefin Jones [3228]				
1766	Llio Davies [3237]				
	Mair Pierce [3238]				
1767	Mari Roberts [3247]				
	Elinor Jones				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers	
	[3248]					
1768	Maldwyn Owen [3250]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13				
1769	Andrew Walton [3251]					
1770	Angharad Tomos [3252]					
1771	Eddie Ladd [3253]					
1772	Manon James [3255]					
1773	Colin Nosworthy [3257]					
1774	Robin Farrar [3258]					
1775	Mared Tudur [3259]					
	Phil Steele [3260]					

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1776	Elinor Gray Williams	STRATEGIC POLICY PS13			
1777	[3261]				
1778	Justin Davies [3262]				
1779	Bryn Moseley				
1780	[3265]				
1781	Christine Muskin [3266]				
1782	Gwynfor				
1783	Jones [3272]				
1784	Lisa Owen [3275]				
1785	Rhodri Owen				
1786	[3281]				
1787	Rhys Tudur [3282]				
1788	Tegwen Parri				
1789	[3283]				
	Dafydd Williams				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1790	[3212]				
1791	Tudur Roberts [3244]				
1792					
1793	Shan Ashton [3358]				
1794					
1795					
1796					
1801					
1802					
1804					

#### TAI 1 – Appropriate Housing Mix

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
215	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Policy TAI 1	Object	Point 4 introduces the idea of a phasing requirement, however no explanation or justification of this is given in the supporting paragraphs. HBF object to the principle of phasing unless it can be	<b>Accepted in part</b> – The policy notes that phased development will only be applied where it is appropriate to do so. Paragraph 4.13.3 of PPW refers to phased development in terms of safeguarding the Welsh language and paragraph 12.1.7 of PPW refers to the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>justified, a view supported by PPW para 2.5.</p> <p>Remove reference to phasing in point 4 or justify in supporting text.</p>	<p>ability to provide acceptable infrastructure. The Welsh Language Impact Assessment also refers to phased development in some circumstances in order to reduce any possible impacts on the Welsh language. It is important therefore to ensure phased development from a practical perspective and to sustain communities. It is therefore important to keep the reference to phased development in the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is noted that Focussed Change NF62 that derives from comments received in relation to the Plan's impact on the Welsh Language, proposes to introduce an additional policy in order to provide more guidance on phased development. This change will therefore be relevant in terms of responding to this comment.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF62</b></p> <p>In order to ensure clarity and to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.</p>
414	Grŵp Cynefin (Rhys Dafis) [2953]	Policy TAI 1	Support	The Policy's wording is appropriate to the Plan area.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
431	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	Policy TAI 1	Support	It is important to provide a cross-section of housing of different types, new build, inventive and energy-effective, in order to ensure suitable housing for people at different stages throughout their lives. This is very important to keep people in the local community, and therefore to protect the Welsh language.	<p><b>Note comment</b> – It is important that the houses provided meet identified needs in order to help sustain communities. Attention is drawn in addition to other relevant policies in the plan such as PCYFF2 ('Design and Place Shaping').</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
734	Llanystumdwy Community Council (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	Policy TAI 1	Object	It is noted here that 'a Supplementary Planning Guidance for this field will be published to provide more guidance'. We repeat our observations in p.7.1.4.	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – It is noted that the comment on paragraph 7.1.4 refers to Policy PS1 'Welsh language and culture'. It is confirmed that an SPG will be prepared for the topic of 'Maintenance and creation of distinctive and sustainable communities'. Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan (Schedule of Supplementary Planning Guidance) indicates that this SPG is relevant for policy PS1, ISA1 and SP5. It is believed that a specific reference to Policy TAI1 can be added to this list as well.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add a reference to Policy TAI1 in the column 'Relevant Deposit Plan Policies' in Appendix 9 as regards the 'Maintenance and creation of distinctive and sustainable communities' SPG.</p> <p><b>Minor change NB24</b></p> <p>In order to ensure the internal consistency of the Plan</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					and to ensure the Plan provides appropriate cross referencing.
735	Llanystumdwy Community Council (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	Policy TAI 1	Support	<p>Point 6 says 'Improve the quality and the suitability of the existing housing stock'.</p> <p>We fully agree with this and it should be encouraged at all times rather than building new ones.</p>	<p><b>Note comment</b> - Agree that this should be encouraged but also note that there is scope to develop new housing as long as it meets the Plan's strategy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
957	CPERA (Coun. Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	Policy TAI 1	Object	<p>It is necessary to collaborate with the University to plan for the housing needs of Bangor. A great deal of student dwellings were approved over the past few years and as a result, student flats are everywhere and houses for rent around the city are vacant. These rented housing are not affordable for the social sector as the rent is set for students. Therefore they are currently empty. Therefore, the existing empty houses should be considered before building more houses.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Agree that the University has an important role regarding the housing market in Bangor and it is therefore important to co-operate with them. It is noted that joint discussions has taken place with officers from the University within the preparation of the Plan. See specific policies in the Plan in terms of 'purpose built student accommodation' (TAI6) and 'Subdivision of existing properties into self-contained flats and houses in multiple occupation' (TAI 2).</p> <p>The empty housing situation in Bangor has been considered as part of the Urban Capacity Study which assesses the potential for meeting the demand for housing units in settlements without having to allocate greenfield land outside of boundaries. This information is fed into the housing needs figures set out in the Plan and how the demand will be met per Centre.</p> <p>If there is no demand for rental housing from students then market influence means a shift in demand in terms of who will live in these units.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
962	Botwnnog Community Council (Mrs Gwenda Roberts) [1541]	Policy TAI 1	Object	In the face of an ageing population, and the emphasis by the government to care for them in their communities, shouldn't the proposed plan ensure that there are purposeful houses for them in the communities in which they live? It is vital that the older people are able to spend the rest of their lives in the community and environment that they have always been used to.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is believed that the Plan's strategy and the policies contained in it, e.g. Policy TAI1 and Policy TAI4, facilitate such relevant developments in order to maintain and strengthen communities. Reference is also made to the intention to publish an SPG that will provide more information in relation to the housing mix in the Plan area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
965	Bangor City Council (Mr Gwyn Hughes) [1523]	Policy TAI 1	Object	<p>The Council is of the opinion that the JLDP should include policies to encourage 'Living Above the Shop' in Bangor's High Street. This would:</p> <p>i) Provide much needed residential accommodation in a sustainable location.</p> <p>ii) Give vacant upper floors of High Street shop buildings an economic use which would result in an incentive for landlords to invest in these buildings.</p> <p>iii) Bring security and vitality back into the town centre.</p> <p>iv) Help to regenerate the High Street.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is not considered necessary to have a specific policy in the Plan for this. Space above a shop can be converted into one flat without planning permission i.e. it is permitted development.</p> <p>If the space is to be converted to more than one residential unit, then the Plan's current housing policies, such as TAI 2 and TAI14 would be relevant considerations. It will be important to ensure that any such development does not adversely affect the vitality and viability of the town centre, in accordance with policies PS12, MAN1 and MAN2.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
969	CPERA (Coun. Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	Policy TAI 1	Object	The High Street and the city centre should also be used for dwellings, as well as commerce and entertainment. Buildings higher than three storeys should not be permitted while building student flats or halls on non-campus sites.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Plan is already facilitating relevant residential development in town centres as long as they do not adversely affect their viability and vitality.</p> <p>Policy TAI6 ('Purpose built student accommodation') would deal with applications for student accommodation. The height of such developments is a factor that will be considered at the planning application stage. It will be necessary to consider the specifics of an application on the basis of its own merit in accordance with the requirements of policies such as Policy PCYFF2, 'Design and Place Shaping'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1267	Rural Housing Enabler (Mr Arfon Hughes) [1189]	Policy TAI 1	Support	A suitable provision of housing in rural areas is important in order to promote sustainable communities, and changes in welfare rights mean that people are forced to move to smaller properties. A higher percentage of the rural population are eager to live in their native habitat and it is important to be able to offer these types of houses for them. There is also an ageing population and the need for housing that is easy to adapt so that people are able to live in their homes and communities for as long as possible. The Rural Housing Enabler for Gwynedd has a central role in this to ensure that this policy contributes to the right type of provision in the County.	<p><b>Note comment</b> - It is imperative that the plan meets identified needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1421	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	Policy TAI 1	Object	<p>The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <p>* In circumstances where it would assist to satisfy a local need for housing, including schemes that conform to the Affordable Housing Policy.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is believed that the Plan promotes the right kind of development in the right locations. It will therefore facilitate housing development for meeting local needs, including affordable housing, as long as they satisfy the Plan's housing strategy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					No change

**TAI 2 – Subdivision of Existing Properties to Self-Contained Flats & Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs)**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers Comments and Recommendations
80	Cyngor Cymuned Y Felinheli (Cyng Sian Gwenllian) [2683]	POLICY TAI2	Support	Agree	<b>Note the supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
430	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	POLICY TAI2	Support	Constructing multiple occupation buildings that are suitable for the elderly should be encouraged, for example with one biomass boiler.	<b>Note the supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
523	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	POLICY TAI2	Object	TAI 2 HMOs. What is the position if existing non-shared accommodation already exceeds the suggested limits?	<b>Not accepted</b> – criterion 3 of the policy seeks to ensure that a proposal does not lead to an excessive concentration of such uses to the detriment of a residential area.  The policy explanation sets various threshold levels within different Wards in Bangor City. If an area is higher than this threshold, it would be expected that the application would be refused unless other material planning



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers Comments and Recommendations
					<p>considerations outweigh the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
526	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	POLICY TAI2	Support	TAI2: HMOs - we welcome first attempt to put a cap on non-shared accommodation and use a 'preferred search zone'.	<p><b>Note the supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
629	Tom Brooks [3034]	POLICY TAI2	Object	<p>Conversion of property that is suitable for families that are converted in this way removes essential homes for younger local residents from the available pool.</p> <p>Change: The word 'terraced' in qualification 1 should be removed. A new condition should be inserted after A5 that "the property is not listed as being within a relevant settlement in TAI5" should Borth y Gest be added to the list of communities specifically mentioned in TAI 5 Or the new condition should state that "the property is not within a coastal village", should Borth y Gest be considered as in that category.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – sub-division of existing houses to self-contained flats and HMOs can help to ensure that an appropriate mix of houses is available in the Plan area.</p> <p>However, to ensure that consideration is given to problems which may arise from such developments, various factors need to be considered with any application, namely the appropriateness of the existing house in relation to the proposed development and its impact on the amenity of nearby uses. Therefore, it is not considered that two-storey terraced houses are suitable for sub-division.</p> <p>Other responses deal with the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers Comments and Recommendations
					<p>appropriateness of including Borth-y-Gest in policy TAI 5. However, a proposal in a settlement in policy TAI 5 or a Coastal Village would be considered against the policy criteria and the expected growth level of the settlement rather than on the grounds of what category it comes under.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
743	Cyngor Dinas Bangor (Mr Gwyn Hughes) [1523]	POLICY TAI2	Object	<p>The City Council welcomes the curbs and safeguards included in the JLDP regarding this type of accommodation in Bangor and also welcomes the limit imposed on the density of such accommodation in the various wards as set out in the document. However, it is of the opinion that the definition of this type of accommodation need to be made clear and unambiguous in the Plan. The Topic Paper "Student Accommodation" is welcomed as is the commitment to update the data in the Topic Paper on an annual basis.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – reference is made to Houses in Multiple Occupation in the Glossary of Terms at the end of the Deposit Plan. However, it is felt that further explanation could be given here within its context with policy TAI2.</p> <p>Also, there is no reference to Self-contained Flats in the Glossary of Terms, and it is agreed that this should be added.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the Glossary of Terms in order to provide a better definition of Houses in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers Comments and Recommendations
					Multiple Occupation and Self-contained Flats.  <b>Focussed Change NF111</b>
1177	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY TAI2	Object	Rather than seek for specific amendments to this policy, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies (see Horizon representations in relation to Omissions from the Plan) which would be the relevant policies against which to make consultation responses to the DCO application and to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion to its associated development from this policy.	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – see Councils’ response to new policies proposed by Horizon to deal with Wylfa Newydd.</p> <p>It is not believed that a separate policy is required to deal with a proposal which would be associated with the Wylfa Newydd development. The key issues to be considered with proposals for the subdivision of existing properties will be consistent, no matter who will use the subdivided building.</p> <p>It is agreed that wording could be included in the explanation, drawing attention to considering vacant or under-used buildings as temporary construction workers accommodation before they become available for residential use. However, the unpredicted need of settlements would have to be considered as well as the impact of such developments on this.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Include wording in the policy explanation to confirm that vacant / under-used buildings could be one of the options to contribute</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers Comments and Recommendations
					towards meeting the needs for temporary workers' accommodation.  <b>Focussed Change NF63</b>
1269	Partneriaeth Tai Gwynedd / Gwynedd Housing Partnership (Elfyn Owen) [3052]	POLICY TAI2	Support	The average size of households is decreasing which leads to a change in their constitution, with a higher number of single person households. This, coupled with the changes in welfare policy, means that more people are seeking smaller housing units. Information on the numbers of people seeking on-bedroom properties who have been identified as homeless by the Council demonstrates this. In the same vein, there is a need for 2 bedroom properties to ensure that families who are affected by the welfare policy are able to move to smaller properties. This policy can assist in ensuring that an adequate provision of 1 and 2 bedroom properties are available.	<b>Note the supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

**TAI 3 – New Build Purpose Built Accommodation, Housing in Multiple Occupation and Other Housing with Shared Facilities for Transient Construction workers**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1177	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	7:4 Omissions	Object	<p>Horizon requests that clarification be provided as to which of the policies in Chapter 7.4 are intended to apply to the Wylfa Newydd worker accommodation strategy and, more specifically, which aspects of the worker accommodation.</p> <p>Rather than seek for specific amendments to the policies within this chapter, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed above which would be the relevant policies against which to make consultation responses to the DCO application and to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion to its associated development from this policy.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Policy TAI 3 makes specific reference to new build purpose built accommodation for temporary construction workers for Wylfa Newydd.</p> <p>In response to another objection there is a focussed change to the explanation to policy TAI 2 ‘Sub-division of existing properties’. This explains that vacant / under used buildings could contribute towards meeting part of the need for temporary construction workers’ accommodation.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1178	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox)	POLICY TAI3	Object	<p>On the basis of the suggested Wylfa Newydd policies, references in this policy to "transient construction workers" should be deleted; the policies in this respect should be replaced by</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – Whilst not accepting the Wylfa Newydd specific policies suggested by Horizon, see specific response to these matters, agree to amend policy TAI 3 through the removal to the reference to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[2919]			<p>the Wylfa Newydd specific policies.</p> <p>As to the rest of policy TAI3 too, rather than seek for specific amendments to the policy, which is too prescriptive to enable the facilities Horizon will require, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies (see Horizon representations in relation to Omissions from the Plan) which would be the relevant policies against which to make consultation responses to the DCO application and to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion to its associated development from this policy.</p>	<p>the term 'transient'.</p> <p>In addition there are amendments to wording and re-arrangement of criteria within the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Removal of reference to 'transient' from the policy and amendments to wording and re-arrangement of criteria within the policy.</p> <p><b>Focussed Changes NF64</b></p>

**TAI 4 – Residential Care Homes, Extra Care Housing or Specialist Care Accommodation for the Elderly**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
--------	------	---------	------	--------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
424	Grŵp Cynefin (Rhys Dafis) [2953]	Policy TAI 4	Support	The population is ageing, and a sufficient supply of housing that is suitable for them must be provided. It is important that this includes adapting current housing, rather than over-providing additional housing. We should aim to enable older people to stay in their communities, which in turn adds to the social and economic sustainability of those communities	<p><b>Note comment</b> - It is believed that the Plan facilitates this type of provision. Reference is also made to Policy TAI1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1268	Gwynedd Housing Partnership (Elfyn Owen) [3052]	Policy TAI 4	Support	<p>The population is ageing and therefore there is a need for appropriate housing provision such as bungalows, flats or units that can easily be converted. Two extra care housing schemes have been developed in the County with a third scheme due to start in September. Although this model meets some of the ageing population's need, a constant supply that is appropriate or can be adapted for an ageing population such as lifetime homes and the Design Quality Requirement for homes which receive Social Housing grant is needed. The Older People Housing Strategy is based on analytical work to identify areas with a higher density of older people, which can lead to a higher dependency on care services in the future.</p>	<p><b>Note comment</b> - It is believed that the Plan facilitates this type of provision. Reference is also made to Policy TAI1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



TAI 5 – Local Market Housing

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1031	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>Paragraph 9.2.4 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) makes it clear that market housing to meet specific local housing needs would normally have no occupancy condition. Such a departure from national policies need to be justified with robust evidence. Therefore, the evidence should go further and detail why the affordable housing policies, and the provision of intermediate affordable housing, could not assist in meeting the identified need. Furthermore, paragraph 7.4.39 states that local market housing, allowed under Policy TAI5, will be restricted to those who are eligible by S106 legal agreements. Therefore, it does not comply with PPW, i.e. that the obligation is "necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms" (PPW 3.7.6).</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – It is believed that the wording of paragraph 9.2.4 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) sets out clearly the opportunity to introduce such a policy. It is noted that authorities are required to prepare policies that meet local challenges and if there is a need for those policies to deviate from national policy that this has to be based on robust evidence. It is believed that strong and sound evidence is provided in Topic Paper 17 to support and justify the policy and what it aims to achieve.</p> <p>It is noted that the objector has not challenged the methodology/criteria associated with the policy nor reinforced their views with compelling evidence.</p> <p>It is believed necessary to ensure that the units subject to this policy meet local recognized needs in perpetuity. Whilst the explanation to the policy in the Deposit Plan notes that the units should be bound through a section 106 agreement, it is proposed to amend the wording in order to give an opportunity to use other methods to achieve this, e.g. a planning condition. This can be explained further in the relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance that will be prepared in terms of this topic. Regarding the use of planning obligations, it is believed that this is acceptable in accordance with the wording of paragraph 9.2.4 of PPW.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>It is accepted that more information should be provided in the policy and in Topic Paper 17 to explain how this policy is different from affordable housing policies in meeting specific needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Remove the reference to using a section 106 agreement in the explanation to the policy (paragraph 7.4.39) in order to provide an opportunity to use other methods to tie the housing to be local market housing.</p> <p>Provide more information in the policy and also in Topic Paper 17 to explain how this policy is different from the affordable housing policies in terms of meeting specific needs.</p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify any further amendments to the Deposit Plan to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF66</b></p> <p>To ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
599	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>Only allowing local market and affordable housing will weaken communities socially and economically, increasing deprivation. National Policy requires a mix of affordable and market housing to ensure sustainable communities. Restricting development to local market housing will result in social imbalance.</p> <p>Only allowing local need or affordable housing in certain settlements is likely to ensure a failure to deliver the required level of housing. Local need and affordable housing can only be achieved through balanced, viable development (incorporating open market and affordable housing). "Local needs" housing duplicates affordable housing provision and is not necessary or deliverable.</p> <p>The Policy should be deleted.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is believed that this policy strengthens rather than weakens certain communities where there are obvious problems in the local housing market. It provides opportunities within local housing markets and thereby promotes social sustainability. These locations have been chosen on the basis of a clear methodology in Topic Paper 17. It is noted that the objector has not challenged the methodology/criteria associated with the policy nor reinforced their views with compelling evidence. It is noted that open market housing is still available at these locations within the existing housing stock. In this regard it is strongly believed that this policy should be maintained.</p> <p>It is believed that PPW offers an opportunity to introduce such a policy in specific locations where the evidence confirms this. It is noted that authorities are required to prepare policies that meet local challenges and if there is a need for those policies to deviate from national policy that this has to be based on robust evidence. It's the serious problems in some specific settlements that has led to this Policy. It will be possible to provide new open market housing in other locations within the Plan area.</p> <p>Local housing market is different to affordable housing. It is believed that developments in the named settlements in the policy are viable on the basis of purely local market housing developments or their joint development with affordable housing.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>There is no reason to consider that this policy will not lead to the provision of the required level of housing in particular settlements. Topic Paper 17 refers to the success of similar policies in areas of England that experience housing pressure. The monitoring framework will identify whether the Policy has been successful or not.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
286	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>The HBF object in principle to the idea of restricting open market housing to 'local people' as it is an undue constraint on the private market. This policy appears to be over-restrictive on development that is acceptable in principle as it is within an identified settlement boundary or development boundary. Such a policy should be limited to exception sites.</p> <p>Remove the 'local market housing</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – On the basis of the wording of PPW, it is important to introduce the policy in very specific parts of the Plan area where there are serious problems within the housing market and where it would be beneficial both socially and economically. In this regard it is believed important that the policy is applicable to developments within development boundaries so that it can fulfil its intention. Policy TAI10 helps to increase the provision of affordable units to meet local need on rural exception sites.</p> <p>It is noted that the objector has not challenged the methodology/criteria associated with the policy nor</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>requirement'.</p> <p>Add an extra point (1 iii.) which allows open market sale if the other two criteria can not be met.</p>	<p>reinforced their views with compelling evidence.</p> <p>The requirement for local market housing should not be removed as it seeks to ensure opportunities in areas where evidence shows that real problems exist. Therefore the policy is not considered to unduly restrict development in those areas.</p> <p>Based on what the policy is trying to achieve, an additional criterion should not be added which gives an opportunity to meet needs on the open market. However there will be opportunity to release property to a wider market, for example via a clause in a 106 agreement, if there is no local interest within a specified period, in order to maximize the opportunity to get a mortgage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
611	Tom Brooks [3034]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>TAI5 is unreasonably selective in its choice of "relevant settlements". In the Topic Paper, Borth-y-Gest is attributed with the characteristics of the Porthmadog West ward. The analysis therefore produced a false result in relation to the characteristics of Borth-y-Gest.</p> <p>Borth-y-Gest, if compared with Mynytho, Sarn Bach etc. would more than equally qualify as a "relevant settlement".</p> <p>Borth-y-Gest should be added to the list of communities mentioned in TAI 5. Failure to do so is likely to rapidly extinguish the remaining Welsh element in the village and create a ghost village outside the main tourist season.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> - The assessment in terms of the settlements that will be considered within this policy is based on information in the geographical form of wards. It is accepted that marked differences can exist within some wards in terms of their social, economic nature etc.</p> <p>Based on the fact that the policy focuses on wards where there are acute problems in the housing market, an assessment was carried out on other settlements that were noted as coastal villages in the Plan in order to establish whether they were relevant for inclusion in this policy (since the percentage of holiday homes or second homes in these coastal villages are higher than the average in the area). Together with Borth-y-Gest, these are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Aberffraw</li> <li>• Llanddona</li> <li>• Llangoed</li> <li>• Malltraeth</li> <li>• Edern</li> <li>• Morfa Bychan</li> <li>• Morfa Nefyn</li> </ul> <p>Settlements were assessed on the basis of Output Areas, which is the smallest geographic area for census information. As information for each indicator is not available for this level and as it is not possible, on the basis of its geographical size and the range of evidence/information available, to compare individual</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>settlements like Borth-y-Gest (which is an individual settlement within the wider ward) with the situation in individual wards, it was necessary to make an objective assessment based on the information available whether it should be included as a relevant settlement in Policy TAI5.</p> <p>The findings of this work was that the following Villages should be included in Policy TAI 5;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Borth-y-Gest</li> <li>• Morfa Bychan</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Include Borth-y-Gest and Morfa Bychan within Policy TAI 5.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF65, NF66</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
70	Nefyn Town Council (Liz Saville Roberts) [2710]	Policy TAI 5	Object	It is requested that coastal villages Morfa Nefyn and Edern are added to the list of Local Market Housing villages in Gwynedd due to the high percentage of second homes. Evidence - according to the 2011 Census, 28.3% of households in the Morfa Nefyn ward (which includes Morfa Nefyn and Edern) are without regular residents. Note that this is higher than a community which is already included, namely Tudweiliog which has a percentage of 19.6%.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - As previously noted, the settlements that are included within this policy should be based on sound and specific evidence as noted in Topic Paper 17.</p> <p>Morfa Nefyn and Edern have been re-considered as part of the assessment of sub-areas (see the case of Borth-y-Gest) in order to establish whether they should be included in this policy. This is based on the fact that they have been identified as coastal villages in the Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that second homes is only one indicator in terms of choosing the relevant settlements. After undertaking the assessment in full, neither Morfa Nefyn nor Edern are to be included in Policy TAI5.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change.</b></p>
628	Iwan Edgar [251]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>Support the principle of the policy but it does not go sufficiently far. The policy should be extended to cover the whole of Dwyfor (+ Penrhyndeudraeth) and to consider this for more areas in Gwynedd and Anglesey.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan should proactively</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Paragraph 9.2.4 of PPW refers to the need to "develop policies to meet the challenges and particular circumstances evident in their areas in specific locations". Therefore it is necessary to focus on those particular areas within the Plan area that have the most profound problems within the local housing market. This is a way of tackling the imbalances in those housing markets, and maintaining and strengthening those vulnerable</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>protect the language and should be consistent with what is expressed in other sections of the Plan.</p> <p>The 'Gwynedd Housing and Income' report supports the argument for extending the area and shows how unaffordable housing is for the indigenous population and the reports of Hanfod 1 and Hanfod 2 shows that there is some potential influx already in Dwyfor following the housing constructed between 2001 and 2011.</p>	<p>communities.</p> <p>As the policy needs to deal specifically with those areas where there are the most profound problems, the information in Topic Paper 17 highlights how those areas were selected on the basis of a clear methodology and indicators.</p> <p>It is therefore necessary for the selected areas to be based on sound evidence as mentioned in paragraph 9.2.4 of PPW, "If these policies need to diverge from national policies in order to meet specific local housing needs for market housing (which normally would have no occupancy restriction), local planning authorities will need carefully to justify the variation with robust evidence that they deem appropriate."</p>
633	Cyngor Tref Pwllheli (Mr Robin W Hughes) [1235]	Policy TAI 5	Object	Partly support the 6 areas but need to expand them to include the rest of Dwyfor and consider other areas within Gwynedd.	<p>On the basis of the wording of PPW, only those places where the problems in the housing market are most severe and where the introduction of such a policy is really necessary to ensure social and economic interests can be considered. It is noted that there are other policies within the Deposit Plan which assist local people to find opportunities within other housing markets in the Plan area e.g. relevant provision of affordable and appropriate mix of housing.</p>
635	Grŵp Ffocws Cynllun Datblygu Lleol (Mr Iwan Edgar) [3050]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>Support the principle behind this policy - but object to it as it does not go far enough.</p> <p>The policy should apply to all of Dwyfor and other parts of the two counties.</p> <p>It should be proactively protecting the Welsh language to coincide with 5.6, 5.8, 6.23, 6.24, 6.25, 7.1.2, 7.1.3, 7.1.4 and Strategic Policy PS1.</p>	<p>Such a policy cannot be linked directly to the Welsh language, i.e. the occupation of housing units cannot be restricted to Welsh speakers only. This is identified on the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				The policy should be extended across Dwyfor and in further parts of Gwynedd and Anglesey.	<p>basis of the wording of Paragraph 3.7.4 of TAN 20 'Planning and the Welsh Language' (October 2013) which states that "LDP policies which take into account the needs and interests of the Welsh language should not seek to introduce any element of discrimination between individuals on the basis of their linguistic ability. Planning policies should not seek to control housing occupancy on linguistic grounds". However, it is reasonable to conclude that a side-effect of what would be achieved through implementing this policy would be to provide opportunities for economically active people to stay or return to the area, which would be beneficial to the Welsh language.</p> <p>It is emphasized that the information and methodology set out in Topic Paper 17 is the basis for selecting the specific settlements which are relevant for the policy, but as noted with the response to representation 611, an assessment considers whether villages that have been located within wider wards should be included.</p> <p>Topic Paper 17 will be updated to reflect additional research that has been undertaken since February 2015.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Although there was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the soundness of the plan, it is noted that a review has been carried out on the suitability of including in the policy any Coastal</p>
941	Councillor Alwyn Gruffydd [381]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>Policy TAI5, 'Local Market Housing' is to be welcomed warmly but the number of specific settlements which are designated for such a policy must be extended beyond the 6 areas which are currently noted in the Plan.</p> <p>The results of the recent Census has shown a decline in the percentage of Welsh speakers in the majority of the County's communities, and extending the Local Market Housing areas would be a useful tool to address community and linguistic viability.</p> <p>Increase the number of specific settlements named under policy TAI5 'Local Market Housing' to protect our communities and safeguard the Welsh language.</p>	
534	Hunaniaith (Ms Debbie Ann Williams) [1307]	Policy TAI 5	Object	Policy TAI5, 'Local Market Housing' is very much welcomed but the number of designated settlements should be extended for the policy, beyond the 6 areas currently noted in the Plan.	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				The most recent Census results have shown a decline in the percentage of Welsh speakers in the majority of the County's communities and extending the Local Market Housing areas would be a useful tool to address community and language viability.	Village situated within wider wards (as stated in the previous comment). Topic Paper 17 will reflect this additional work.  <b>No change</b>
630	Menter Môn (Helen Thomas) [1615]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>Policy TAI5, 'Local Market Housing' is very much welcomed but the number of designated settlements should be extended for the policy beyond the 6 areas currently noted in the Plan.</p> <p>The most recent Census results have shown a decline in the percentage of Welsh speakers in the majority of the County's communities and extending the Local Market Housing areas would be a useful tool to address community and language viability.</p> <p>Increase the number of specific settlements named under Policy TAI5 'Local Market Housing' in order to protect the communities of Gwynedd and the viability of the Welsh language.</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
644	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Policy TAI 5	Object	There are other villages with significant second home pressure which should be included in this list. We question whether the Section 106 mechanism to require 'local' use (without an affordable condition) can be applied in practice, given the precedent for many of these to have been lifted.	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>The settlements that have been selected for this policy are based on specific indicators. Second homes is just one of these indicators.</p> <p>While there are other examples in Gwynedd of local housing conditions which have been lifted, these are units which were developed in accordance with the former Dwyfor Local Plan. There was no limitation on the size of those units and, therefore, when considering these conditions in accordance with the contents of the Gwynedd UDP, they cannot be considered to be affordable either. Additionally, the policy basis for those units has now gone.</p>
281	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>Local market housing</p> <p>Expand the boundaries with this. That would make the market larger e.g. the whole of Dwyfor and Penrhyndeudraeth would be local market</p>	<p>The proposed policy is different because it is based on evidence and a clear methodology which means that it only applies to certain settlements where there is evidence that there are serious problems within the local housing market. It also derives directly from what is stated in paragraph 9.2.4 of PPW. The size of residential units will also be restricted in order to ensure that the policy meets local needs and are more likely to be accessible to similar households in the future.</p> <p>As previously stated, it is recommended removing the reference to Section 106 in the explanation for the policy in order to allow the possibility of using other means of tying units to being local market ones.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
625	Gwynedd Rural Housing Enabler (Mr Arfon Hughes) [1189]	Policy TAI 5	Support	<p>Welcome the paper that assists people to live in their areas and to contribute to their communities. The paper acknowledges the challenge to "satisfy specific local housing needs for open market housing". The paper makes reference to the intermediate model, and the Unit would welcome this option. A number of people cannot afford to buy a house, but do not fall into the category of needing social housing.</p> <p>Information from Tai Teg and Gwynedd's Common Housing Register shows that there is a need for housing and more work is needed at grass roots level to ensure the validity of this need in terms of local need.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
638	Gwynedd Housing Partnership (Elfyn Owen)  [3052]	Policy TAI 5	Support	<p>Welcome the paper which assists people to live within their areas and contribute to their communities. It acknowledges the challenge to meet specific local housing needs for open market housing. Reference is made to the intermediate model and the Unit would welcome this option. A number of people cannot afford to buy a house but do not fall into the category of needing social housing.</p> <p>Information from Tai Teg and Gwynedd's Common Housing Register clearly demonstrates that there exists a need for housing.</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
428	Grŵp Cynefin (Rhys Dafis) [2953]	Policy TAI 5	Support	<p>Policy TAI5 is suitable for the situation of the communities that have been noted in it</p>	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
82	Planning and Housing Department, Denbighshire County Council (Angela Loftus) [2719]	Policy TAI 5	Support	<p>Support the principle of the policy to limit open market homes to local need in areas of high demand for second homes.</p>	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
207	John Brinley Jones [2087]	Policy TAI 5	Object	<p>To remove Policy TAI5 from the final version. Policy is against the European Convention on Human Rights - Protocol No. 12 to the Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms Rome, 4.XI.2000.</p> <p>To remove para 7.4.37 Policy TAI5 from the final version.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – It is strongly believed that the policy should be maintained. It is believed that the wording of Paragraph 9.2.4 of PPW clearly states the opportunity to introduce such a policy and that strong and robust evidence is provided in Topic Paper 17 to support and justify the policy and what it seeks to achieve. It is noted also that other planning authorities have created a similar policy and have been using it for years (as shown in Topic Paper 17).</p> <p>Protocol number 12 (i.e. the protocol specified by the objector) provides for a general prohibition of discrimination on any ground such as sex, race, colour, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, association with a national minority, property, birth or other status. It is not believed that this policy runs counter to the protocol.</p> <p>Based on the precedent set by other authorities and the evidence to support the policy, it is not believed that there is a basis for the objection.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
66	Beaumaris Town Council (Prof TW Ashenden) [1267]	Para. 7.4.37	Support	There is a lack of affordable housing in Beaumaris. The increasing number of holiday homes and lets makes the situation worse. Beaumaris Town Council welcomes the application of a local market policy to Beaumaris.	<p><b>Comment noted</b> – While it is noted that the policy is not for affordable housing, it will help areas where serious problems exist within the housing market.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
205	John Brinley Jones [2087]	Para. 7.4.39	Object	<p>It should be noted that business owners that create employment and wealth in the area who require a home in one of these villages and have a plot that they should not be subjected to very stringent affordable sized dwellings since they may require additional facilities within their homes such as office space or areas where they could work from home.</p> <p>To consider each planning application on merit rather than have a blanket policy on size of the dwelling that obviously can not meet all requirements.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - This policy is a means of assisting those areas within the Plan area where there are serious problems within their housing markets. It is therefore relevant to very specific locations that have been identified through evidence. It is a way of attempting to overcome the problems in the housing market and the social and economic problems that accompany these. It is therefore believed that it is critical to control the types of housing units that can be promoted in the locations named in the policy in order to overcome these serious problems. Open market housing will still be available in these locations within the existing housing stock.</p> <p>Note that local market houses are not affordable houses, and therefore their maximum size, as specified in the policy, is bigger than would apply to affordable housing. It is important that the size of local market units is controlled to ensure that the value of the units is more compatible with the policy objective of supporting the communities in the long term.</p> <p>There is no single size specified for the maximum size of</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>local market units but rather different figures have been identified for different types of units (on the basis of whether they are single storey or two-storey houses and also in terms of the number of bedrooms). This is important to ensure that the policy meets different needs effectively.</p> <p>It is noted that the objector has not challenged the methodology/criteria associated with the policy nor reinforced their views with compelling evidence.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
206	John Brinley Jones [2087]	Para. 7.4.39	Object	<p>The occupancy of local market housing will be restricted to those who are eligible, without a Section 106 legal agreement. Maximum size of units will be decided on merit and requirements of applicant. No blanket policy on size restraint.</p> <p>Remove section 106 and maximum size restraint.</p> <p>To consider each planning application on merit rather than have a blanket policy that obviously can not meet all requirements.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is believed that it is necessary to tie the units that would be allowed in accordance with this policy to be local market ones in order to ensure that the policy is implemented effectively and that it meets its objectives in the first instance and in the long term as far as possible. Appropriate means of doing this can be considered in the Supplementary Planning Guidance that will accompany the policy.</p> <p>It is important to limit the size of local market units. While the maximum size of units that would apply in accordance with this policy exceeds the size of affordable housing, they can not be excessive in size as this would run counter to the objectives of the policy - to ensure a value that is more in keeping with the objective of maintaining communities. The maximum size of local market units depends on their type. There is no single overall figure for each property. This is important to ensure that the policy meets different needs effectively. There is a close relationship between the size of the units and what is sought to achieve through the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

**TAI 6 – Purpose Built Student Accommodation**

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan</b>	<b>Officer Comments and Recommendations</b>
674	Mr Noel Davey, Council for the Protection of Rural Wales	Policy TAI6 Student Accommodation	Object	The area for student accommodation would seem to be too large and there are fears that the student population may not be able to fill it, thus leaving Bangor with an excess of single-person housing.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.</p> <p>The search area is where the majority of the purpose built student accommodation is located. It is considered to be sensible to focus new student accommodation development in this broad area. However, it is not the Council’s intention to flood the search area with an excessive level of student accommodation or single-person housing. Any proposal will have to provide evidence over the need for the development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
726	Hughes Brothers Ltd	Policy TAI6 Student Accommodation	Object	Feel the policy is too restrictive without justification for some of the matters sought such as support from a higher education institute, prohibit development within primarily residential area, prevent	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.</p> <p>The proposed revision to Point 1 significantly</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>development on sites with extant planning permission or allocated for residential development where development would not prejudice meeting housing needs and the justification for the policy should explain that the preferred search zone does not preclude the development of student accommodation elsewhere if it satisfies the criteria within the policy. Suggested amendments are given to the criteria within the policy to reflect the above mentioned issues.</p>	<p>reduces the requirements from the applicant and omits the need for a comprehensive assessment of student demand and the support of a higher education institution, both of which are considered to be of great importance in establishing the most appropriate levels of student accommodation. The revision would weaken the impact of the policy in terms of directing the development of future student accommodation to the most appropriate locations and managing the capacity of such development.</p> <p>This proposed revision does not take into consideration the Preferred Search Zone identified on the Proposal Map.</p> <p>It is felt that the existing wording for Point 4 is stronger than the proposed revision and is appropriate to ensure that students can attend the College in a sustainable mode of transport.</p> <p>The Preferred Search Zone in the policy is an area of mixed uses within the City in close proximity to the majority of the University's buildings and campus. An applicant can present evidence at an application stage to support a proposal for new build outside the preferred</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>search zone</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
738	Gwyn Hughes, Bangor City Council	Policy TAI6 Student Accommodation	Support	The Council welcomes the criteria set out in this policy relating to the siting of such developments and also welcomes the inclusion of the Preferred Search Zone of the Proposals MAP.	<p><b>Note supporting Comments</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
942	Menter Iaith Bangor	Policy TAI6 Student Accommodation	Object	Very careful consideration should be given to permitting further residential developments for the students of Bangor University. In the face of uncertainty regarding students’ ability to fund their higher education away from home, a decline in the demand and excess of empty accommodation in private hands would be severely detrimental to the stability of Bangor’s communities and the Welsh language. A detailed investigation should be undertaken into the housing needs of the people of Bangor. Include Penrhosgarnedd in the city! It should be ensured that rented housing is affordable rather than charging an inflated rent as is paid by students.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Criteria 1 within the policy seeks evidence to support any proposed development in terms of need.</p> <p>The release of existing housing stock into the general housing market can assist with meeting the housing growth from the existing population and will be monitored annually in the Annual Monitoring Report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### TAI 7 – Replacement Dwellings

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
604	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	Policy TAI 7	Object	<p>It is considered that not allowing the replacement of temporary residential accommodation such as prefabricated houses is unreasonable and undeliverable. If the unit has lawful residential use it should have the right to be redeveloped under the replacement dwellings policy.</p> <p>This policy should be reviewed and the policy requirement number 5 and paragraph 7.4.47 should be deleted.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The nature of temporary housing (e.g. caravan or chalet) or buildings that were built with short life materials (e.g. prefabricated house) means that it would not be appropriate to provide a more permanent structure in their place.</p> <p>There are strict rules for the development of new residential units in the countryside and it is believed that enabling the construction of permanent units instead of temporary/short life accommodation runs counter to the principles of the Plan and national guidelines in terms of sustainable development in the countryside.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
642	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Policy TAI 7	Object	<p>Criterion 7 should also apply WITHIN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES. Our concern arises especially from the experience of rebuilding holiday homes in coastal communities such as Abersoch, where replacement dwellings</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> –</p> <p>Criterion 6 – This criterion is relevant for all replacement dwellings, whether they are within or outside the development boundaries. Even within development boundaries, preference should be given for a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>have been approved of much greater scale, volume and footprint than the original structure. We think the policy should be reinforced explicitly in respect of replacement dwellings. The present text gives the impression that these conditions would not apply within development boundaries. We note that TAI 7 criterion 6 requires a replacement dwelling to be 'within the same footprint as the existing development' whether within or outside the development boundary.</p>	<p>replacement dwelling to be located on the same footprint as the existing dwelling. This is due to visual and amenity considerations. The criterion however does allow some flexibility to relocate a dwelling within the same curtilage if this is deemed more appropriate. The relevant housing policies also give more flexibility for appropriate relocation within development boundaries.</p> <p>Criterion 7 - Disagree with the comment. Whilst the principle of what is stated is accepted, there are other policies within the Plan that would deal with applications within the development boundary. It is possible to build larger houses within the development boundary as the application can be considered as a new house. This is unlike the situation in the countryside where housing policies are much more stringent.</p> <p>The scale, design etc. would be relevant considerations in relation to any application within the development boundary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
737	Llanengan Community Council (Ms Einir Wyn) [1548]	POLICY TAI17	Support	Too many houses have been removed/demolished in this community in recent years - a dozen since 2010 - and enormous houses have been erected to replace traditional and indigenous buildings.	<p><b>Note comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>



**TAI 8 – Residential Use of Caravans, Mobile Homes or Other Forms of Non-Permanent Accommodation**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
641	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TAI8	Object	<p>23.4 Single Statics Summary. We are concerned about the proliferation of single static caravans in rural areas, often in exposed and unscreened locations, which have an adverse impact on the landscape. Policy TAI8 does not adequately address the problem which arises in part from unsatisfactory UK legislation. New legislation relevant to Wales is needed, but in the meantime planning policy should make clear a commitment to monitor siting and use of single static caravans and, wherever practicable, enforce conditions of colouring and screening that would mitigate landscape impact.</p> <p>Change: commitment to increase planning control over proliferating single statics.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>Policy TAI8 clearly states those circumstances where it would be appropriate to provide a static caravan in a rural location for residential use. The policy clearly states the temporary nature of such units and it also notes that “the siting of temporary residential caravans or other forms of non-permanent accommodation will be subject to the same locational considerations as permanent residential dwellings”.</p> <p>Other policies, such as Policy PCYFF2, are also relevant to this extent, specifically in terms of the impact of such units on the landscape.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of</p>

					the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------

## Affordable Housing

### Context and Introduction

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
750	Rhys Llwyd [3087]	Para. 7.4.60	Object	<p>I'm concerned that there is not enough emphasis on affordable housing in the plan, especially for local young first-time buyers.</p> <p>There is a need for suitable housing to respond to the local need on two levels:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) to respond to the local need in terms of numbers;</li> <li>ii) to respond to the local need in terms of the price.</li> </ol> <p>Why not include conditions that 75%+ of the houses will be affordable for local people and approve 25% or 15% or 10% only for unaffordable houses. It is sad to see that the plan does not consider assisting first-time buyers to restore houses that are already in the housing stock and to consider them as affordable houses.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – It is believed that the Plan facilitates this need.</p> <p>The provision of affordable housing is based on evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The number of affordable houses to be provided is based on the Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) of both Councils;</li> <li>• The minimum number of affordable houses to be provided by site (Policy TAI9) is based on the Affordable Housing Viability Study by Andrew Golland Associates.</li> </ul> <p>The houses not identified as 'affordable housing' will not be unaffordable. For example, these houses will be available to people living within the Plan area that would not be eligible for intermediate affordable housing, controlled by a section 106 agreement, which controls the occupancy and price, or affordable social housing, which is usually managed by registered social landlords.</p>

					<p>The Plan strategy seeks to provide the right type of housing in the right locations. It is noted that Policy TAI 5 ('Local Housing Market') also applies in this respect.</p> <p>The two Councils, within their housing strategies, promote the restoration of empty housing to meet local housing needs, including the need for affordable housing. In addition, the Urban Capacity Study Plan considers the number of empty houses in the main centres and includes these opportunities within the Plan's windfall figure. This is something that the Plan facilitates.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
--	--	--	--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1033	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	Para. 7.4.65	Object	<p>Planning Policy Wales (PPW, paragraph 9.1.4) states the importance of local authorities understanding their whole housing system so they can develop evidence based market and affordable housing policies. A key component of this evidence base will be a Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA).</p> <p>Paragraph 9.2.16 (PPW) also states that LDPs should include an authority-wide delivery target for affordable housing, based on an LHMA. The LDP should express the total affordable housing need (including any backlog) over the whole plan period in the reasoned justification to the affordable housing policy.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – The Plan refers to the current Anglesey and Gwynedd LHMA findings. In accordance with the needs of the Welsh Government, the LHMA is currently being updated by the two Councils.</p> <p>The affordable housing figure within PS14 is based on the level of affordable units which could be achieved on the basis of affordable units completed since 2011, the number with planning permission in the current land bank, and the level of expected growth of new allocations on the basis of the % of affordable housing in the different Housing Price Areas.</p> <p>However, in order to better explain the level of expected growth it is agreed that adding a table in the Explanation to PS14 would better explain the level of affordable housing that the plan can achieve.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add a table in the Explanation to Policy PS14 to show how the figure of 1,400 affordable houses will be achieved.</p> <p><b>Focused change NF67</b></p> <p>To improve the clarity of the Plan.</p>
------	-----------------------------------------	--------------	--------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

310	Home Builders Federation (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Para. 7.4.66	Object	<p>HBF consider that the £5,000 allowance for S106 contributions in the viability testing is too low. The draft SPG on Developer Contributions due to be prepared for the inquiry should help to clarify this. The report also identifies that a high % of units are delivered on smaller sites, the HBF believe that a number of the assumption used in the testing are taken from National Builders figures and do not fully represent the type and range of development taking place in the borough.</p> <p>Reconsider figures used for S106 contributions in viability report. Liaise with small builders to understand viability on small sites better and feed results into viability testing.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Note that the average figure is £5,000 (not including contributions in relation to affordable housing) which has been established with the two authorities on the basis of the monitoring information available. Also note that discussion has taken place with regard to this figure in a workshop that included stakeholders from the local housing market.</p> <p>The Affordable Housing Viability Study is based on local evidence i.e. planning permissions between 2009 and 2012. This highlights the prevalence of development on smaller sites in the area.</p> <p>It is agreed that the SPG in relation to 'Planning obligations' will give more information regarding this area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
-----	--------------------------------------------------------	--------------	--------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1036	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	Para. 7.4.66	Object	<p>Further clarification is required to explain what costs, related to the obligations/ contributions have been taken on board. The viability work does include this aspect but the specific costs are unclear. It is for the authorities to demonstrate what other planning obligations/contributions will, or will not cover (see also comments in relation to deliverability).</p> <p>Challenging targets need to be grounded in evidence and applicable to the majority of applications, whilst allowing site specific negotiations to occur, if/ where necessary (on a limited number of sites). All components of the viability evidence need to be justified.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Paragraph 3.12 of the Affordable Housing Viability Study (2013) identifies a contribution of £5,000 per unit in terms of all section 106 contributions other than affordable housing. This figure, which represents an average contribution per dwelling, was used within the baseline testing, which is the basis for the information noted in Policy TAI9.</p> <p>As noted in response to representation 310, it is agreed that the SPG in relation to 'Planning obligations' will give more information regarding this area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
------	-----------------------------------------	--------------	--------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

PS14 – Affordable Housing

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
727	Llanystumdwy Community Council (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	Strategic Policy PS14	Object	<p>It is stated here that 'Sufficient land is identified to provide a minimum target of 1,400 new affordable homes'.</p> <p>Does this mean that the remainder of the houses, around 4,500 will not be affordable?</p> <p>Our evidence (Llanystumdwy Community Council Area Housing Needs Survey) confirms that local people do not have the means to buy even an affordable home.</p> <p>Need to increase the percentage of affordable homes within the Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>The 'open market units' facilitated within the Joint LDP (i.e. units that are not called affordable) are not 'unaffordable'. For example, these houses will be available to people living within the Plan area that would not be eligible for intermediate affordable housing, controlled by a section agreement 106, which controls the occupancy and price, or affordable social housing, which is usually managed by registered social landlords.</p> <p>The provision of open market housing will ensure that schemes are financially viable and in this respect they will be subsidizing the provision of affordable housing. It is important to note that all new residential development, in accordance with Policy TAI 1 (Appropriate Housing Mix), can contribute to improving the balance of housing and meeting the needs of the whole community. Therefore it is anticipated that open market housing in a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
63	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	Strategic Policy PS14	Object	<p>This means that there will be far too many houses that aren't affordable which will have to be included in the plan. The Council's language and housing study shows this.</p> <p>A much larger percentage of affordable housing</p>	<p>number of housing market areas will be 'affordable' through design/market forces without the need for a mechanism such as a section 106 agreement. Both local planning authorities have been able to facilitate this kind of housing unit.</p> <p>In addition to information from the Local Housing Market Assessment, the level of affordable housing to be provided is based on the findings of the Affordable Housing Viability Study (Andrew Golland Associates). This Study has established the viability of affordable housing and the possibility of providing this within particular sub market areas. Consequently, a shared policy is proposed (Policy TAI 9); in some sub-market areas at least 25% affordable housing is required (where a certain threshold is reached). The figure in other sub market areas is at least 15%. So the viability of schemes and the possibility of providing these are major considerations within the affordable housing policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan. Keep the figure of 1,400 affordable houses.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1179	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	Strategic Policy PS14	Object	Rather than seek for specific amendments to this policy, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed above which would be the relevant policies against which to make consultation responses to the DCO application and to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion to its associated development from this policy.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – While policies such as TAI3 are directly relevant to developments in relation to Wylfa Newydd, it is also vital to consider a number of other relevant policies of the Plan - including PS14 and TAI 9.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1034	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	Strategic Policy PS14	Object	The authorities need to explain the relationship between the target within the LHMA and the level of affordable/ market housing proposed in the plan. It is necessary for the authorities to demonstrate that they are maximising provision through the LDP given the high level of need. Further clarification is required to explain what delivery rates are expected from current commitments and how allocations will contribute to the affordable housing need target. It remains unclear how 1,400 affordable housing will be delivered and whether the authorities have explored all options to maximise provision through the LDP given the	<p><b>Accepted in part -</b></p> <p>Agree that the content and findings of Anglesey and Gwynedd LHMA's could be better integrated in the Joint LDP. Both LHMA's can clarify the role of the Joint LDP better, and make these links more clearly.</p> <p>It is important to note that not all new affordable units identified in the LHMA would be newly built and managed within the joint LDP policies with a mechanism such as a section 106 agreement. Therefore, it is important to note that the Joint LDP is just one tool to ensure that the demand for affordable housing is met.</p> <p>Although the JPPU believes it is possible to provide the affordable housing target identified in the Plan, the rationale behind this figure could be made more explicit</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>very high level of needs identified for the first 5 years of the plan alone i.e. relationship to market housing.</p>	<p>by reference to the LHMA. It is stressed that the target of 1,400 new affordable homes is the minimum figure.</p> <p>Work to update Gwynedd and Anglesey LHMA is underway at present. However, it is noted that the LHMA applies for a period of 5 years, while the figure stated in the Joint LDP applies to the Plan period as a whole (up to 2026).</p> <p>In order to better explain the level of expected growth it is agreed that adding a table to the Explanation to PS14 would better explain the level of affordable housing the plan can achieve. For example, emphasize the role of housing allocations, windfalls, exception sites, houses in a cluster and converting rural housing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add a table in the Explanation to policy PS14 to show how the figure of 1,400 affordable houses will be achieved.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF67</b></p> <p>To demonstrate compatibility with other key plans and strategies and to ensure clarity.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
434	Grŵp Cynefin (Rhys Dafis) [2953]	Strategic Policy PS14	Support	There is a need to be completely clear what the term "affordable housing" means when implementing this policy	<p><b>Note comment</b> –The glossary at the end of the written statement gives information on 'affordable housing'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1266	Coun. R.H. Wyn Williams [367]	Strategic Policy PS14	Support	Welcome any policy and plan for affordable housing in the area with evidence of local need also, for the benefit of our communities.	<p><b>Note supportive comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
283	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	Strategic Policy PS14	Object	<p>Affordable housing</p> <p>Increase the minimum target to reflect what, it seems as though, the County's residents can afford. 61.4% of Gwynedd's residents cannot afford to buy a house and therefore things do not make sense. It is required to reduce the number of houses in the Plan down, and increase the percentage of affordable housing.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – As noted in response to comment 1034, there is a link between the target of providing a minimum of 1,400 new affordable housing and the Information in the Anglesey and Gwynedd Local Housing Market Assessments. As noted in relation to comment 1034, a table will be prepared that shows how the figure of 1,400 affordable houses will be achieved.</p> <p>The link with the response to comments 728, 273 and 68 in relation to Policy TAI9 is also noted - with the percentage of affordable houses that are to be provided on specific sites being based on the findings of the Affordable Housing Viability Study.</p> <p>Please refer to the response to Strategic Policy PS13 with regards to the considerations in relation to the number of housing units to be provided within the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

#### TAI 9 – Affordable Housing Threshold & Distribution

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
728	Llanystumdwy Community Council (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	Policy TAI 9	Object	Chwillog is in the category of 15% of affordable homes. To coincide with the Llanystumdwy Community Council Area Housing Needs Survey Report, there is a need to increase it to 60-70%, and not 15%.	<p><b>Accepted in part -</b></p> <p>The percentage of affordable housing to be provided is based on the findings of the Affordable Housing Viability Study. The method as a whole considers the financial relationship between the residual value and the existing use value in two stages: 'High Level Testing' (HLT) and 'Generic Site' testing. The HLT looks at residual value across a range of densities and sub-markets and all tests consider a series of affordable housing targets (from 0% to 50%). In addition, consideration is given to the impact of other Section 106 contributions. In this regard,</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
273	Mrs Marian Jones [2832]	Policy TAI 9	Object	<p>Affordable Housing</p> <p>15% of affordable housing in Llŷn.</p> <p>Therefore, who will buy the remaining 85%? There is evidence that shows that 60%+ of Gwynedd residents cannot afford to buy houses.</p> <p>Will this open the floodgates for more non-Welsh speaking migrants?</p>	<p>establishing the percentage of affordable housing to be provided within the various sub-markets is based on a sound and clear methodology.</p> <p>Note that the percentages stated in the Policy are minimum figures, and a higher figure may be needed if it financially viable. It is also important to note that Policy TAI 5 ('Local Housing Market') is applicable to specific areas within the Plan area where there are serious problems in the housing market.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>
68	Nefyn Town Council (Liz Saville Roberts) [2710]	Policy TAI 9	Object	<p>The percentage of affordable housing in the Llŷn area should be 25%.</p>	<p>Add text in the explanation to the policy regarding methodology for re-assessing average house prices in different areas and its impact upon the viability of the percentage of affordable housing provision sought. Such a mechanism can be presented in the SPG on affordable housing.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF69</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity and to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
951	Gwynedd Rural Housing Enabler (Mr Arfon Hughes) [1189]	Policy TAI 9	Support	The policy TAI 9 noting the need to have a 'pro-rata payment' rather than having no affordable provision on the site at all is to be welcomed, as this secures help to gain a supply of affordable housing which could be of help to Housing Partners to ensure that a scheme is viable.	<p><b>Note supportive comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1035	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	Policy TAI 9	Object	In order to maximise affordable housing delivery and meet the key objective, the viability work has identified hotspots related to specific geographical areas within the plan area. The authorities should consider whether the wording of TAI9 is strong enough to negotiate much higher percentages of contributions from these specific hotspots.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – It is believed that the current wording within the policy of 'at least' 15% or 25% means that there is an opportunity to obtain a higher level of affordable housing in the areas with the highest prices in the Plan area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1263	Gwynedd Housing Partnership (Elfyn Owen) [3052]	Policy TAI 9	Support	The Housing Partnership is eager to promote suitable developments within areas of need, and table 8.2 of the Housing and Population Topic paper clearly states 'that planning permissions for housing granted to public bodies / Housing Associations form a low proportion of the residential units considered within the Joint Housing Land Availability Study for Gwynedd (April 2013).' This shows the small impact of the work of the Housing Associations compared to the private sector. Housing Policy 9 notes that 'a pro-rata payment...rather than no affordable provision on the site' would be welcomed as this would ensure assistance for a supply of affordable housing, and could help housing Partners in ensuring that a scheme was viable.	<p><b>Note supportive comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
443	Cynefin Group (Rhys Dafis) [2953]	Policy TAI 9	Support	<p>The 'amount of houses in the development' threshold for the different type of communities is suitable.</p> <p>The percentage of affordable housing in the development based on its location is suitable.</p>	<p><b>Note supportive comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				The requirement to receive a community sum on sites where it is not possible to provide affordable housing is appropriate, so that there is a way to plan affordable housing or social housing on other sites in the same area in order to be viable.	
60	Beaumaris Town Council (Prof TW Ashenden) [1267]	Policy TAI 9	Support	There is a lack of affordable housing in Beaumaris. The increasing number of holiday homes and lets makes the situation worse. Beaumaris Town Council welcomes the application of the affordable housing policy to Beaumaris (25% in developments of 5 or more units) and Llanfaes (100%).	<p><b>Note supportive comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
345	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	Policy TAI 9	Object	The policy does not consider new housing in open countryside (although this is dealt with elsewhere) and it is unclear what the affordable housing commitment would be for such development. Add an additional level to the hierarchy that makes reference to new dwellings and the conversion of dwellings in open countryside. This should make reference to Strategic Policy PS15, for clarity.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Policy PS15 ('Settlement Strategy') indicates that only housing developments that comply with the contents of PPW and TAN 6 will be permitted in the open countryside.</p> <p>Note that new houses in the open countryside should meet specific needs related to rural enterprises. In terms of affordable housing, TAN 6 (para. 4.13.4) notes "Where an appropriate rural enterprise worker cannot be found to occupy the rural enterprise dwelling, eligibility should be extended to persons who would be eligible for consideration for affordable housing under the local authority's housing policies."</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
288	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Policy TAI 9	Object	The wording of 3 ii. needs clarification as, if properties are required to be built to DQR standards (definitely required by RSL's if grant is provided to the scheme) then it will not be possible to comply with this requirement due to size and external requirements. Need extra wording to 3 iii. to cover	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p><b>Conflict with Development Quality Requirements standards:</b></p> <p>It is very important that affordable housing units are fully integrated within a residential development. If there is a conflict between this and the need to meet DQR</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>independent arbitration where viability can not be agreed between the Council and the developer.</p>	<p>standards, this could be discussed during the planning application stage, and it is possible to establish any viability issues during this stage also. In policy terms, in order for a plan to be successful, it is essential that affordable houses are not distinct from market houses. This is important in order to integrate them socially and in terms of design considerations.</p> <p><b>Independent conciliation:</b></p> <p>It is accepted that a comment regarding conciliation could be included within the policy or the explanation to it. Refer to the fact that the two Councils will assess the viability plans in the first instance to establish whether the provision of affordable housing is appropriate. However, if there is disagreement, it is possible to conduct an external assessment (e.g. by the District Valuer Service). The applicant will pay for this service.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Add a comment related to conciliation within the policy, i.e. where it is not possible for the Council and the developer to agree on development viability.</p> <p><b>Focused change NF68</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1043	Mr Mark Newey, Welsh Government	Policy TAI 9	Object	<p>LDP affordable housing policies should not include the range/type/mix of housing as matters could change over the lifespan of the plan and potentially inhibit the delivery.</p> <p>However, LDPs should include reference to the latest information within the reasoned justification to enable effective negotiation. Dependent on the mix, which may have financial implications, the delivery of affordable housing (percentage sought on site) could also be impacted. The LMHA does assess the full range of housing requirements, but this is not referenced specifically in the LDP. The plan would benefit from including such information which could be factored into the viability calculations to demonstrate consistency with the evidence and no adverse implications.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – part 3(i) of the policy refers to the need for developments to achieve an appropriate mix in terms of housing types and house size of local need affordable housing. This is based upon the local housing market assessment or any alternative Council or partner assessment. Therefore the policy does not include a specific range / type/ mix of housing, rather it notes the need to consider this based upon any evidence available as individual applications are assessed.</p> <p>The SPG on Affordable Housing will provide greater explanation over the implications of different mix of affordable housing on individual sites.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
129	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Para. 7.4.68	Object	<p>Why has a two instead of three stage approach been taken to the affordable % requirement and why have areas been included which have been shown aren't currently viable or may become un-viable if current market conditions continue?</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p><u>Two phase approach:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The two-stage approach is preferred due to the content and findings of the latest Viability Report (October 2014). It is believed that this approach is effective in ensuring that the requisite supply of</li> </ul>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>Explain why a two tier approach instead of the 3 tier approach has been taken, and why areas with negative residual value are being required to provide affordable housing.</p>	<p>affordable housing is provided.</p> <p><u>Areas with negative residual value:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is accepted that the latest Viability Report (October 2014) showed a negative residual value in the lower market locations, based on a scenario of 30 dwellings per hectare. However, it is noted that this is the general and generic finding for lower market areas as a whole, and that it is necessary to assess each application individually. If it can be proved during the planning application stage, to the satisfaction of the local planning authority, that it would not be financially viable to provide affordable housing as part of development, then it would not be necessary to do so.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
108	CPERA (Cyngorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	TAI 9 (paragraph 7.4.69)	Object	I realise that affordable housing is needed in Bangor. Need houses for rent and private ownership. Need housing and flats with 1/2/3 bedrooms. Need gardens for children. No detailed work has been undertaken on the needs of the people of Bangor. Need to collaborate (e.g. with the University) to see what is required - plenty of vacant houses for rent by now.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – the Plan’s evidence base identifies the need for affordable housing throughout the Plan area.</p> <p>Part 3(i) of the policy refers to the need for each development to ensure an appropriate mix in relation to the type and size of local need affordable housing.</p> <p>The Plan’s monitoring system will allow consideration to any changes to the pattern of student usage of the existing local housing stock.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
698	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	Para. 7.4.69	Object	<p>The requirement to provide at least 25% affordable housing is not acceptable, as it implies no upward limit on the need for affordable housing to be sought on development sites. The level should be specified as up to 25% affordable housing.</p> <p>Policy does not consider the impact of s106 burdens. Policy does not set a differential rate for affordable housing</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Residential development must be viable, so there is a limit to the number of affordable houses that can be requested. Cannot ask for a percentage of affordable housing if it means that the development is not viable. The Affordable Housing Viability Assessment (by Andrew Golland Associates), which provides the evidence base for this policy, has identified a minimum in terms of the percentage of affordable units that should be provided, however it is vital to consider the specific circumstances for each application individually.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				based on previously developed or the green field sites. Does not consider development viability and does not reflect PPW.	<p>It is believed that the Affordable Housing Viability Assessment has considered in detail the implications of Section 106 Agreement. Therefore viability has been considered within the policy, and so it is believed that it reflects PPW (para. 2.2.2).</p> <p>The Viability Study has considered the permissions on brownfield and greenfield land. The content of the policy therefore is based on this information, but again it is noted that it is important to consider the specific circumstances of each relevant application in terms of the possible number of affordable houses on site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

#### TAI 10 – Exception Sites

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
645	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks)	Policy TAI 10	Object	Exception sites adjoining but outside development boundaries lead to unplanned development creep and	<p><b>Not accepted -</b></p> <p>While it is accepted that paragraph 9.2.23 of Planning</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	[3036]			<p>ribbon development creation. This may be justifiable for 100% affordable housing sites where a need for such small developments exist but is not justifiable for any open market exceptions. As drafted this policy would go well beyond Planning Policy Wales guidance.</p> <p>That TAI 10 be amended to refer only to permitting 100% affordable housing. This can be achieved by deleting the latter part of the policy.</p>	<p>Policy Wales refers to "special provision of affordable housing exception sites" and "affordable housing exception sites are not appropriate for market housing", paragraph 4.2.2 of TAN 6 ('Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities') states "Planning authorities should employ all available policy approaches, in an innovative way, to maximise the supply of affordable housing" Information provided in Topic Paper 3 'Population and Housing' notes the limited impact of exception sites in providing affordable housing in the Plan area. In accordance with the wording of TAN 6, this policy therefore provides an innovative approach to increasing the provision of affordable housing and therefore to meet the Plan's affordable housing target.</p>
984	Rob Booth [3033]	Policy TAI 10	Object	There should be no open market houses outside the development boundary.	
1032	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	Policy TAI 10	Object	<p>Policy TAI10 states that in exceptional circumstances open market housing may be included to make a proposal viable. However, sites that include a mix of market and affordable housing cannot be classed as 'exception sites' under national policy - TAN 2 explicitly states that such sites are not appropriate for market housing (para. 10.14).</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>market housing will meet local needs.</p> <p>The number of market houses provided would be small, but this would trigger the provision of more affordable housing to meet local needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change to the policy. Strengthen and update the evidence provided in Topic Paper 3 to justify the provision of a minimum number of market houses on exception sites in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
945	Gwynedd Rural Housing Enabler (Mr Arfon Hughes) [1189]	Policy TAI 10	Support	<p>I welcome this policy that will be of assistance to ensure that a suitable model is developed within areas, more than likely rural areas. Providing affordable housing schemes is difficult to achieve without the assurance that market units are available to cross-subsidise a scheme.</p> <p>There is a strong link here with the Local Market Housing Policy. It's a method of ensuring that developments occur within areas where there is a clear need for affordable housing with an element of selling on the open market in order to ensure that schemes are viable.</p>	<p><b>Note supportive comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1262	Gwynedd Housing Partnership (Elfyn Owen) [3052]	Policy TAI 10	Support	<p>We welcome this Policy that will assist in ensuring that suitable models are developed within areas, probably rural areas. We can provide information that shows that some schemes are more difficult than others to realize without assurance that there are units available to subsidise the scheme. Table 7.13 in the 'Housing and Population' Topic Paper on Rural Exception Sites shows the numbers of developments on exception sites, with clear comparisons to be seen in the numbers. The strong link here with the Local Market Housing policy is a means of ensuring that developments occur within areas where there is a need for affordable housing with an element of selling on the open market in order to ensure that schemes are viable. This will facilitate the development of Community Land Trusts within specific areas.</p>	<p><b>Note supportive comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
309	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	Policy TAI 10	Object	This policy risks damaging sites or features of local biodiversity value or important features in wildlife/green corridors. Insert reference to the need to comply with other policies of the Plan especially those related to the protection of biodiversity.	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>While this policy provides the principle of developing housing on exception sites, there are other policies and guidelines which would need to be considered when assessing their suitability for such a development. For example, Strategic Policy PS16 ('Conserving and enhancing the natural environment'), Policy AMG4 ('Local biodiversity conservation') and guidelines in Chapter 5 ('Conserving and Improving Natural Heritage and the Coast') of PPW are relevant in protecting a site with a biodiversity value.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
446	Grŵp Cynefin (Rhys Dafis) [2953]	Policy TAI 10	Support	Policy TAI10 is greatly welcomed. It will provide homes for those that local house prices on the open market are well out of their reach. A planning guideline will be required regarding the nature and source of the evidence of need that will have to be submitted to support a planning application.	<p><b>Note comment –</b> It is noted that the proposed SPG on 'Affordable Housing', as set out in Annex 9, will be relevant for Policy TAI10</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
452	Grŵp Cynefin (Rhys Dafis) [2953]	Para. 7.4.79	Object	A planning guideline should be provided to explain the nature of the evidence that will be acceptable when aiming to justify including open market housing	<p><b>Not accepted</b> –The proposed SPG on 'Affordable Housing', as set out in Annex 9, is relevant for Policy TAI10.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
449	Grŵp Cynefin (Rhys Dafis) [2953]	Para. 7.4.83	Support	This will avoid stigma and will ensure that the affordable housing receives the same construction focus.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

## Gypsy Traveller Accommodation

### Context and Introduction

Rep ID	Person/ Organisation	Section	Support / Object	Summary of Rep	Comments and Recommendations
1028	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.4.90	Object	Clarification is required on how and when the additional 16 permanent pitches and what the authorities' need are in relation to the 28 transit pitches (identified as being required across North Wales), and when these are required. The authorities have acknowledged that not every	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that including wording that refers to the period when the additional pitches are required would provide a useful link between the latest Gypsy Traveller Accommodation (GTANA) Assessment and the Plan, and</p>

				group of Gypsies and Travellers can be accommodated on the same site, and the authorities need to clarify whether this has been taken into consideration when making provisions for Gypsies and Travellers.	<p>improve the monitoring work. Additional work has been undertaken by both Councils to show how the unmet need identified in the latest GTANA (2015) will be met over the next 5 years.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend text as outlined above to ensure clarity and to demonstrate that the Plan has full regard to emerging data and evidence</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF:70</b></p>
1673	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]		Object	Text in Topic Paper 18 Identifying Gypsy and Traveller Sites states that all sites included within a range of listed criteria will be discarded However, the designation of C1 flood zone should not be automatically discarded. Such sites should be subject to a justification test instead of further limiting potentially suitable options.	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>Initially it is considered that the preferred site should continue to be a site which isn't within zone C1, but, if there are no possible sites available, then sites in Zone C1 should be assessed in accordance with TAN15.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend text in revised Topic Paper 18 to ensure clarity and to demonstrate that appropriate regard is made to National Policy and Guidance</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**Policy TAI 11 – Safeguarding Existing Gypsy & Traveller Sites**

Rep ID	Person/ Organisation	Section	Support / Object	Summary of Rep	Comments and Recommendations
--------	----------------------	---------	------------------	----------------	------------------------------

1076	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY TAI11	Object	Policy TAI11 - relates to the safeguarding of existing sites, the phrase should be widened to: "safeguarded as a permanent residential site to be solely used by Gypsies and Travellers".	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> Add "and Travellers" to the end of the first sentence of Policy TAI 11. Amend wording in second sentence to ensure consistency in terminology</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend text as outlined above to ensure consistency.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF71</b></p>
1260	Partneriaeth Tai Gwynedd / Gwynedd Housing Partnership (Elfyn Owen) [3052]	POLICY TAI11	Object	Local Authorities must conduct a survey of the needs of Gypsies and travellers by February 2015, and this will be a follow-up to the work undertaken in 2011. This will provide us with current information on needs, and we intend to commission this work on a regional basis. The Housing partners will support this work.	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The summary of representation is accepted as a matter of fact, The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) has engaged with Housing Services in the preparation of the GTANA (2015)</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No amendments are required to address the representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

#### TAI 12 – Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations

Rep ID	Person/ Organisation	Section	Support / Object	Summary of Rep	Comments and Recommendations
1074	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.4.97	Object	Further clarification is required in relation to step 4 (relating to the 'detailed site assessment') and policy should also reflect that the process is in relation to finding public Gypsy and Traveller sites, as opposed to private sites.	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is suggested that the relevant parts of section 7.4 are amended to accord with the comments received. The revised updated Topic Paper 18: Identifying Gypsy and Traveller Sites should explain and clarify the methodology used to assess</p>

					<p>and identify possible permanent residential sites for social accommodation for Gypsy and Travellers and the possible temporary stopping places.</p> <p>Amend wording of Policy TAI 12 to refer to all allocated sites for permanent residential social accommodation and all allocated temporary stopping places for Gypsies and Travellers. Identify proposed Gypsy Traveller Site allocations on the Proposal Maps.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amend text as outlined above to demonstrate that the Plan has full regard to emerging data and evidence.</p> <p><b>Focused Change: NF:72</b></p>
1075	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.4.99	Object	<p>By including 'up to 5 days at a time' restricts the Local Authorities in future if they found this time limit was counter-productive. It also states that a transit site of 15 pitches could be required to accommodate 15 caravans. ). However, the Welsh Government's Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites guidance states each transit pitch should be capable of accommodating two touring caravans. Therefore, a site of 8 pitches should suffice.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> It is suggested that the relevant parts of section 7.4 are amended to accord with the comments received and to take account of the updated Topic Paper 18: Identifying Gypsy and Traveller Sites and in particular the methodology used to assess possible temporary stopping places.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amend text as outlined above in order to ensure accuracy and to demonstrate that the Plan has full regard to emerging data and evidence.</p> <p><b>Focused Changes: NF73</b></p>

### TAI 13 – Sites for Gypsies and Traveller Pitches

Rep ID	Person/ Organisation	Section	Support / Object	Summary of Rep	Comments and Recommendations
1077	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY TAI13	Object	<p>These criteria relate specifically to residential sites and do not allow for future transit site needs. Criterion 2 is not clear that public transport links are not always available, particularly where sites are allocated in accordance with paragraph 7.4.102.</p> <p>Criterion 4 is extremely flexible due to the use of the word "including." Consider limiting these factors to those already mentioned and add "unless mitigation is possible and proportionate."</p> <p>Criterion 6 is unreasonable as the guidance applies to Local Authority sites and not private sites. Clarify that public sites should have regard to that guidance whilst private sites would be regulated under the Mobile Homes (Wales) Act 2013.</p> <p>Criterion 9 is already covered by policy TAI11.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is suggested that Policy TAI13 is amended to take account of the comments submitted. Whilst it is accepted that private sites would be regulated under the Mobile Homes (Wales) Act 2013. It is considered that the Good Practice Guidance by Welsh Government about designing sites for Gypsies and Travellers should continue to be referred to, but make it clear that, in the case of private sites, that compliance with it isn't compulsory. Include wording to say that the local planning authorities consider that private providers should consider it when they design sites and try to address as much as possible of the guidance. It is considered that the Council should not have lower design expectations for the design of new private sites and extensions compared to public sector sites.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend text as outlined above to ensure clarity and to ensure that the policy can be easily interpreted.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change: NF:74</b></p>
1078	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.4.104	Object	<p>Paragraph 7.4.104 could be reasonable in relation to permanent residential sites but not in relation to transit occupants.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is suggested that paragraph 7.4.104 is amended to take account of the comments received.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



					Amend text as outlined above to ensure clarity. <b>Focus Change: NF:75</b>
1079	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.4.105	Object	Paragraph 7.4.105 should clarify that private site developers should not be required to live in the area before submitting a site planning application as this could otherwise have the effect of limiting freedom of movement . Welsh Government planning circular 30/2007 makes clear that such a requirement would be unacceptable and contrary to national policy	<b>Accepted</b> Omit reference to local connections in the text and Policy TAI 13.  <b>Recommendation</b> Amend text as outlined above to demonstrate that appropriate regard is made to National Policy and Guidance.  <b>Focus Change: NF75</b>

#### Location of Housing

#### PS15 – Settlement Strategy

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
289	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	7.4.113	Object	<p>More provision should be provided by Sub-Regional Centre &amp; Urban Service Centre. These centres are more sustainable and where the market wants to build houses and people want to live. Also the local needs and affordable housing restrictions on village, cluster and open countryside housing mean that these (1,976) units will not contribute to an open market housing total.</p> <p>Increase the % of housing provided in Sub-Regional Centre &amp; Urban Service Centres. Remove the restriction of 'local market housing' on the areas identified above.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is important that the spatial strategy recognizes that the area is very rural and is one that includes a network of different scattered settlements. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It is going to ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
626	Dr Morag McGrath [231]	7.4.113	Object	<p>It is difficult to justify development in open countryside. Table 18 shows that Anglesey already has 141 units above the proposed numbers for the entire of the plan period (and 43 over in the clusters). Change: There should be a presumption against any further developments in open</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Plan guides most development to towns and villages. Detailed policies will ensure that development aligns with the Plan’s sustainability principles and national planning policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				countryside on Anglesey unless very exceptional circumstances.	There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
699	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	7.4.113	Object	<p>Tables 18/19 identify the number of units with existing planning permission.</p> <p>Existing permissions should be considered, however they must be reviewed so that only sites likely to be developed in the plan period are included.</p> <p>Many sites obtain planning permission but are not built. A full schedule of sites relied upon should be provided.</p> <p>Distribution of housing within different settlement categories should be disaggregated to identify the overall level of growth currently committed to individual settlements.</p> <p>In making new allocations, the effect of existing commitments should be considered and compared to the relative size, role and function of each settlement.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Councils undertake Housing Land Studies annually in consultation with representatives of the construction industry and infrastructure providers. Information from the Housing Land Study has informed the Plan. Not all the sites which have planning permission have been included in the Plan because evidence suggests that they will not be developed within the period of the Plan.</p> <p>We refer to the Joint Planning Policy Unit’s webpage where reports of the Housing Land Studies are available. We refer also to Annex 5 of the Deposit Scheme which notes land with planning permission by community/town council and by settlement in 2014.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1061	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.4.113	Object	<p>The total of allocations and windfalls appear to fall short of the figure included in the plan at table 17 (1,502 - page 153). The authority needs to ensure the total of allocation and windfall in villages tally to the figure in the plan and ensure this is delivered and that a large number of housing will not be able to be developed in one or a few small villages, as set out in the plan's housing strategy.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – The total number of units allocated within the Villages is 301 units whilst the windfall provision between policies TAI 16 &amp; 17 is 1,157 units. This gives a total of 1,458 units.</p> <p>The shortfall of 44 units from the figure of 1,502 units identified in table 17 as the anticipated growth level for this category reflects those settlements where the actual growth in the period 2011 to 2014 exceeded the Plan's anticipated growth level for certain settlements.</p> <p>To provide greater clarity within the Plan an additional table showing the level of completions achieved over the period 2011 to 2014 will be included within Appendix 5 of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That an additional table showing completions by</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					individual settlements be included within Appendix 5.  <b>Minor Change NB23</b>
83	Beaumaris Town Council (Prof TW Ashenden) [1267]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>The settlements between Llanfairpwllgwyngyll and Llanfaes operate as a suburb of Bangor. Demands on housing in Bangor are driven by the economic success of Bangor and the A55 corridor to the east. As a result the balance of housing allocation between the centres of Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch and the settlements along the Menai Strait inappropriately favours Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch with a result that the current shortage of affordable housing in this area will be made worse. Some of the allocation of new housing to Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch and Bangor should be redirected to the settlements of Llanfairpwllgwyngyll, Menai Bridge, Llandegfan and Beaumaris.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Local planning authorities need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size,</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>Distributing less growth to the main centres and directing more to smaller centres or villages or clusters without a compelling reason to do so would undermine the Spatial Strategy and the sustainability principles underpinning the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
132	Beaumaris Town Council (Prof TW Ashenden) [1267]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>Insufficient weight has been given to the role of the Beaumaris/Llanfaes area as a suburb of Bangor. Demands on housing in Bangor are driven by the economic success of Bangor and the A55 corridor to the east. As a result the balance of housing allocation between the centres of Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch and Beaumaris/Llanfaes inappropriately favours Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch with a result that the current shortage of affordable housing in Llanfaes/Beaumaris will be made worse. A</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – See the response to objection no. 132/1267.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>greater allocation of housing should be made to the Beaumaris/Llanfaes area.</p> <p>Some of the allocation of new housing to Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch should be redirected to Llanfaes.</p>	
284	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	Reduce the numbers approved in the large centres, and increase the numbers in the clusters and the rural areas	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Local planning authorities need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>Directing more housing units that were not distributed in the Deposit Plan to smaller centres would undermine the the Spatial Strategy and the sustainability principles underpinning the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
292	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	Consider more housing should be provided in the Sub-regional centres and urban service centres, as this would be more sustainable and provide housing in areas where the markets wants it.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is important that the spatial strategy recognizes that the area is very rural and is one that includes a network of different scattered settlements. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It will ensure that development is directed to centres that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
347	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	In some circumstances, it may be appropriate to restore vernacular buildings (including abandoned dwellings) in the open countryside to help preserve local character and / or Welsh heritage. This type of development is not currently considered within the policy.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>Directing more housing units that were not distributed to sites in the countryside in the Deposit Plan would undermine the Spatial Strategy and the sustainability principles underpinning the Plan. The Deposit Plan refers to TAN6 - Plans for rural communities (2010). Policy TAI 19 promotes the restoration of appropriate existing buildings to residential use.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
354	WYG/Alliance Planning (Mr Mark Walton) [2905]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Support	Our Client, Admiral Taverns, supports the proposed location and distribution split of housing within sustainable settlements especially the importance of Service Villages in continuing to deliver up to 25% of the housing growth in the Joint Authorities area.	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
461	Tai Twnti Cyf [2868]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>1. Morfa Nefyn is a settlement suitable for modest open market housing growth.</p> <p>2. Additional open market housing sites would not harm the plan strategy nor the welsh language.</p> <p>3. Additional land could be allocated for housing or the development boundary extended to accommodate development. Two sites are suggested.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Morfa Nefyn has been identified as a Coastal/Rural Village. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Local planning authorities need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
482	Mon a Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills) [2937]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	The proposals in respect of distribution of housing growth are insufficiently compliant with national planning policy, which "advises that local development plans should secure a sustainable settlement pattern which meets the needs of the economy, the	<b>Not accepted</b> - The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>environment and health, while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of communities". Reduced focus on Bangor and the A55 corridor and more attention to smaller communities.</p>	<p>the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>Directing more housing units that were not distributed in the Deposit Plan to smaller centres would undermine the Spatial Strategy and the sustainability principles</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>underpinning the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
651	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Support	<p>Policy PS15 - Settlement Strategy - restricts coastal villages to "within development boundaries in-fill or windfall sites". An indicative potential of 10 such sites is allocated to Borth-y-Gest. We note that this is neither a target or a limit.</p> <p>We support this policy especially "Development will be restricted to a scale and type to address community need for housing on windfall/ infill plots within development boundaries. No open market sites will be allocated in these Villages".</p>	<p><b>Supportive comment noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
701	RCH Douglas Pennant [3070]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>Objection to the restriction of growth in Talybont to 2 windfall dwellings over the plan period and the absence of a development boundary. Objection to the sustainability assessment for Talybont (settlement score). The current approach actually puts at risk the viability of local services. Change: a development boundary</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Talybont has been identified as a Cluster. In spatial terms, the Plan seeks to ensure that new development is distributed to reflect the relative ability of settlements to cope with the growth, taking into account their sustainability qualifications in terms of accessibility, availability of facilities and services, as well as size, population and location of the settlement. We refer to Topic Paper 5 which records the qualifications of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				to permit an increased number of dwellings in Talybont, which would better support the local services.	<p>individual settlements. The strategy and the settlement hierarchy reflect the sustainability objectives underpinning the Plan. It is believed that the current distribution of growth is appropriate to ensure that development is suitable and reflects the ability of settlements to cope with the level of growth that can be realized.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
729	Llanystumdwy Community Council (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>Point (ix) states, 'Only development that complies with Planning Policy Wales and TAN6 will be permitted in the Open Countryside'.</p> <p>We disagree with this as we feel that it closes the door on any development in the countryside, which is totally contrary to the nature of this area.</p> <p>The Plan does not sufficiently address the indigenous nature of countryside developments, such as this area.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The strategy and the settlement hierarchy reflect the sustainability objectives underpinning the Plan. It is believed that the current distribution of growth is appropriate to ensure that development is suitable and reflects the ability of settlements to cope with the level of growth that can be realized.</p> <p>Directing more housing units that were not distributed to sites in the countryside in the Deposit Plan would undermine the Spatial Strategy and the sustainability principles underpinning the Plan. The Deposit Plan refers to TAN6 - Plans for rural communities (2010). Therefore, the Plan promotes building new housing units in rural areas if compelling evidence is presented at the planning application stage to justify this. Also through Policy</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>TA119, the Plan allows provision of affordable housing units through proposals relating to the conversion of appropriate buildings in the countryside, if certain criteria can be met.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
730	RCH Douglas Pennant [3070]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>Objection to the restriction of growth in Llandygai to 8 windfall dwellings over the plan period and the drawing of the development boundary. Objection to the sustainability assessment for Llandygai (settlement score). The current approach actually puts at risk the viability of local services. Changes: a wider development boundary to permit an increased number of dwellings in Llandygai, which would better support the local services.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Llandygai has been identified as a Local Village in the Settlement Hierarchy. In spatial terms, the Plan seeks to ensure that new development is distributed to reflect the relative ability of settlements to cope with the growth, taking into account their sustainability qualifications in terms of accessibility, availability of facilities and services, as well as size, population and location of the settlement. We refer to Topic Paper 5 which records the qualifications of individual settlements. The strategy and the settlement hierarchy reflect the sustainability objectives underpinning the Plan. It is believed that the current distribution of growth is appropriate to ensure that development is suitable and reflects the ability of settlements to cope with the level of growth that can be realized.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
814	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Support	A broad 'balanced' housing allocation policy, as consulted on last year, is proposed, comprising: up to 55% in Bangor and the main towns (including Caernarfon, Pwllheli, Porthmadog), at least 20% in Local Service Centres (including Abersoch, Criccieth, Nefyn), and up to 25% in smaller centres. We support this approach.	<p><b>Supportive comment noted.</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
822	Botwnnog Community Council (Mrs Gwenda Roberts) [1541]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	It is noted that 3% of new housing will be provided in the countryside during the Plan period. This is a very low number considering the number of years that the Plan will be in operation. Again there is a need to attract young people to stay in their neighbourhood therefore there will be security in the future for our schools, heritage, etc.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The strategy and the settlement hierarchy reflect the sustainability objectives underpinning the Plan. It is believed that the current distribution of growth is appropriate to ensure that development is suitable and reflects the ability of settlements to cope with the level of growth that can be realized.</p> <p>Directing more housing units that were not distributed to sites in the countryside in the Deposit Plan would undermine the Spatial Strategy and the sustainability principles underpinning the Plan. The Deposit Plan refers to TAN6 - Plans for rural communities (2010). Therefore, the Plan promotes building new housing units in rural areas if compelling evidence is presented at the planning application stage to justify this. Through Policy TAI19, the Plan allows provision of affordable housing units through proposals relating to the conversion of appropriate</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>buildings in the countryside, if certain criteria can be met.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
835	Tudweiliog Community Council (Mrs Glenys Peters) [1236]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	There is a lot of concern about over-development in Botwnnog and Pwllheli and that it will have a significant impact on the Welsh language.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> Botwnnog has been identified as a Service Village and Pwllheli has been identified as an Urban Service Centre. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Local planning authorities need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					Plan.  <b>No change</b>
836	Cyng./Counc Ann Williams [355]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	I feel that the windfall provision of 82 properties is adequate for Bethesda. I greatly hope that the lands which have already been allocated for building are included in this figure, as there is already a substantial allocation for my ward. This would mean that the figure of 82 properties would already have been reached through planning permissions that have already been granted, and applications that are pending.	<b>Comment noted</b> – We refer to Annex 5 in the Deposit Plan which provides information about sites/buildings with planning permission not implemented or not completed in April 2014 by settlement.  The annual Housing Land Study will record how many housing units are built. The Plan’s monitoring framework will record progress against the indicators and targets and thus ensure that development takes place in accordance with the scale noted in the Plan strategy.  <b>Recommendation</b>  There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No change</b>
837	AONB Joint Advisory Committee (Cyngorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	New housing. There was concern about the level of housing provision in the Llyn area and the possible impact that could have on the community and the well-being of the Welsh language. There was specific concern about the provision for Botwnnog and Pwllheli, which seems excessive considering these settlements' size and character.	<b>Not accepted</b> - The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard,

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size,</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
838	Llannor Community Council (Mr Haydn Jones) [1549]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	The Plan provides an indicative figure that there is a need to construct 40 houses in the village of Ffôr between 2011 and 2026. Planning permission has already been granted to construct nine houses which reduces the need to 31 houses. There is reference to a planning application for 40 houses on a site that has already been designated, but has not received planning permission. The Community Council does not support adding to the figure of 40 houses for the village of Ffôr.	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - The Deposit Plan includes a monitoring framework in Chapter 8 which will keep track of how many housing units are built per year and where. The findings will be included in the Annual Monitoring Report and the annual Housing Land Study report.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
841	Jina Gwyrfai [3092]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	There is no demographic need for more housing in Deiniolen - there are enough market/ vacant housing already. Safeguarding natural Welsh communities is what is important here. No more housing in Deiniolen (or the adjoining areas - Clwt y	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Deiniolen has been identified as a Service Village. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>Bont, Gallt y Foel, Dinorwig). Generally only new housing according to natural growth for local people.</p>	<p>promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Plan in order to ensure its soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
842	Jina Gwyrfai [3092]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>As an individual whose roots are in Barmouth, I feel strongly that there is no need for more houses in the town (or in Llanaber). The area is being ruined by overdevelopment and inward migration. I cannot find any evidence in the Plan or on grass roots level to justify constructing 91 new houses. Windfall developers are the only people who profit from these schemes. There is no consideration to the welfare of residents and the community. Remove Barmouth from the Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Barmouth has been identified as a Local Service Centre. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>identity of the communities The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					Plan.  <b>No change</b>
868	Hughes Bros Ltd - [3083]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	The sub-regional centre of Bangor and urban service centres, specifically Llangefni are capable of, and should, accommodate a greater percentage of the housing requirement in order to facilitate best use of resources and infrastructure and to deliver a sustainable pattern of development. Moreover, by indicating that "up to" 55% of the plan's growth should be located within main centres, the policy has the effect of placing a limitation which is not consistent with the strategy of the plan, particularly where developments could be accommodated without offending other policy objectives.	<b>Partially accepted</b> - It is important that the spatial strategy recognizes that the area is very rural and is one that includes a network of different scattered settlements. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Local planning authorities need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities.  The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>The objector refers to the fact that Policy SP15 notes that no more than 55% of housing growth will be directed to the main centres, at least 20% will go to smaller centres and no more than 25% will go to the villages, clusters and countryside. Agree that this is not explicit enough, particularly as this distribution will have to be monitored and reviewed annually within four years.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Therefore in order to ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan it is deemed necessary to make a focussed change to better convey the distribution.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF76</b></p>
895	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	Housing growth should be directed to the largest settlements and areas on a proportional basis reflecting those settlements size, role and function. 55% is directed to the sub-regional centre/urban service centres. 45% is distributed to	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is important that the spatial strategy recognizes that the area is very rural and is one that includes a network of different scattered settlements. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>villages/ clusters, resulting in a significant dispersal and diffusion of housing provision. Housing will be directed to areas with limited opportunities for modes of travel other than the car as well as limited opportunities for employment and key services and facilities. Need to direct at least 60% to the Sub-regional/ Urban Service Centres, 25% to local service centres and 15% to villages and clusters.</p>	<p>participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Local planning authorities need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
907	Llanddeiniolen Community Council (Ms Eleri Bean) [1531]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>Forty houses have been apportioned to Deiniolen. On what basis are the authors of the plan stating that this many houses are required? Sadly there are 5 new houses in the middle of the village, which are empty, and the fear is that they will remain vacant. A detailed local need survey is required for every similar village, but unfortunately the proposed Plan doesn't include this at all. By undertaking a local survey the requirements of each community would be found - is the real need for housing for the elderly, rented housing etc. The plan guesses where housing should go.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Deiniolen has been identified as a Service Village. The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It would also ensure that the Council meets national expectations in promoting sustainable development. In this regard, PPW (Part 9.2) notes that the development plans need to provide a framework that will stimulate, guide and manage change towards a more sustainable pattern of development. Need to find a sustainable settlement network, which meets the requirements of the economy, the environment and health while respecting local diversity and protecting the character and cultural identity of the communities The Deposit Plan identifies a Hierarchy of towns and villages with a specific role and function. A methodology has been developed and published to identify the settlements on the basis of their role, function, range and choice of facilities and services</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>in Topic Paper 5 Developing the Settlement Strategy.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>The types of housing units on sites and layout/design of the sites are issues that will be discussed at the planning application stage. This does not prohibit development for the elderly or other community groups. Policy TAI 1 promotes a mix of housing types and Policy TAI 9 and TAI 10 refer to local affordable housing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
911	CPERA (Cyngorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	Research work at a community level was undertaken in several areas in Gwynedd, following consent from the Council to do this. Nonetheless, this did not take place in Bangor. Bangor's needs differ slightly from the rest of the County; it is a regional centre that is recognised as such by the Welsh	<b>Not accepted</b> - The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It will

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				Government, and therefore, in order to undertake such research in Bangor, there would be a need to carefully co-ordinate this, and also include Penrhosgarnedd, which is part of the Pentir ward. There is a need to look again at which parts of Gwynedd comes within Bangor's boundary.	<p>ensure that development is directed to centres that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
936	Richard Williams [3120]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>The figures show that in future, fewer houses will be needed in the Porthmadog area than in Penrhyndeudraeth. The residents of Porthmadog need better arrangements to ensure that there is a better stock of housing in the community. We cannot accept the argument regarding floods here in Port as there have never been floods here. There is a real need for development here in Porthmadog to improve our housing stock. Our young people and older people need new houses, not in Penrhyndeudraeth, but here, in their own community.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Porthmadog is an Urban Service Centre in the Settlement Hierarchy. The methodology used to allocate housing units in the Plan would usually direct 301 housing units to the Centre. There is unimplemented planning permission for 56 housing units in Porthmadog, and the Urban Capacity Study has identified potential opportunities for 82 housing units by making better use of floors above commercial units, etc. When looking for sites to fill the gap, careful attention was paid to the fact that most of Porthmadog is in flood zone C1 and residential use is noted as an use that should not be directed to flood zones unless it cannot be addressed elsewhere, that there is a demand for it, and that there are positive outcomes as a result of undertaking a flood consequences assessment. Since the publication of Deposit Plan for public consultation, a level 2 flood risk assessment has been carried out. That has confirmed</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>that there are no sites available that are not at risk of flooding. A report on the flood risk assessment level 2 will be published in January 2016 and will form part of a library of EIP. Allocating land for housing in Porthmadog would undermine the sustainability principles of the Plan, contrary to the Sustainability Assessment and would be a fundamental change to the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
938	Llanfihangel Esc Community Council (Alun Foulkes) [3121]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	Concerns regarding the overdevelopment of the village of Gaerwen in permitting too many houses, especially when there are already empty houses in the village. It is important that the houses which are built are appropriate for the location and that a number of affordable houses are permitted.	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It will ensure that development is directed to centres that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>communities.</p> <p>The types of housing units on sites and layout / design of the sites are issues that will be discussed at the planning application stage. This does not prohibit development for the elderly or other community groups. Policy TAI 1 promotes a mix of housing types and Policy TAI 9 and TAI 10 refer to local affordable housing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
939	Menter Iaith Bangor (Mrs Branwen Thomas) [2762]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>Too many houses to be built in Bangor. We are concerned about the impact on the Welsh language. A detailed study should be completed on the whole of the City of Bangor's housing needs (including Penrhosgarnedd) - needs to be defined as an entity. No such work has been undertaken in the past.</p> <p>Undertake a detailed study on housing needs and the impact on the Welsh language in Bangor as one entity, rather than looking at a single ward (Hirael). Need to include Penrhosgarnedd as well.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It will ensure that development is directed to centres that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>The Welsh language has been a consideration in</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1030	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	The strategy of the plan is not questioned; however the growth limitation created by policy wording for the main centres has not been justified. It would seem logical to create growth limitations for the lower tiers rather than for the most sustainable areas.	<p><b>Accepted</b> The comment of general support for spatial strategy of the Plan is noted. Agree that this is not explicit enough, particularly as this distribution will have to be monitored and reviewed annually within four years.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>In order to ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan it is believed that making a Focussed Change is necessary to better convey the distribution.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>Focussed Change NF76</b>
1682 1683 1684 1685	Cylch yr Iaith (Ieuan Wyn) [3128] Canolfan Hanes Uwchgwyrfai (Geraint Jones) Dyfodol i'r Iaith (Dr Simon Brooks) [3136] [3130] Cymdeithas yr Iaith (Dr Menna Machreth) [3138]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	The comments submitted by us in our document relate to housing growth, distribution and allocations, and address the impact of the Deposit Plan on the Welsh Language. The comments draw attention to the deficiencies in the language impact assessments and other documents relating to the Welsh language, and refer to the lack of evidence as well as unreliable evidence. The total numbers of housing growth for both counties and the growth distribution and the allocations within them should be reviewed. The review should be based on evidence deriving from studies of the following key factors: community need for housing, current housing stock, housing affordability, houses for sale/rent, 2011 Census data, a new language impact assessment in line with socio-linguistic principles.	<b>Not accepted</b> The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It will ensure that development is directed to centres that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.  The Welsh language has been a consideration in formulating the vision, objectives, strategies and policies of the Plan since its inception. The potential effects of the Plan on the Welsh language were considered during the Sustainability Assessment process (including the SEA), which was informed by a Language Impact Assessment. Attention should be given to the various policies of the Plan and topic documents, as well as the SPG for: planning obligations, maintaining and creating sustainable communities, affordable housing, the type and mix of housing, and development briefs.  <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1805	CPERA (Cyngorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS15	Object	<p>Certainly there is a need for housing within the city's community boundaries. Affordable housing is required; rented housing and housing for sale. Housing that is managed by Housing Societies if required. Family housing with three bedrooms, housing or flats for individuals or couples or small families; affordable houses/ flats with one, two or three bedrooms. Housing with suitable gardens for children. Children should be able to play safely in their gardens rather than in large green areas without fencing in front of houses. Work has already been undertaken to demonstrate a need for affordable housing in the county (GC, 2013)</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> The distribution strategy was established in the first place during the process of developing the Preferred Strategy of the Plan on the basis of evidence and public participation. In spatial terms the strategy is to ensure that the detailed and strategic policies of the Plan promote developments that address the expectations of the Vision and Strategic Objectives of the Plan. It will ensure that development is directed to centres that are sustainable in terms of size, function, character, facilities, transport links, social and environmental inclusion. Therefore there will be a sustainable pattern of settlement with viable communities.</p> <p>The types of housing units on sites and layout/design of the sites are issues that will be discussed at the planning application stage. This does not prohibit development for the elderly or other community groups. Policy TAI 1 promotes a mix of housing types and Policy TAI 9 and TAI 10 refer to local affordable housing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					Plan.  <b>No change</b>

#### TAI 14 – Housing in Sub-Regional Centre & Urban Service Centres

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
285	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	POLICY TAI14	Object	<p>Housing in the centres.</p> <p>Changes to plan - Too much housing for the benefit of the language. Housing in these centres will empty the Countryside e.g. more houses in Pwllhelli = less people staying in Pen Llyn. Difficulties will occur in due course for schools and Ysgol Botwnnog specifically.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - in order to ensure that economic, social and environmental matters are considered from the start, the Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Assessment (which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment).</p> <p>The Welsh language fits in to the Sustainability Assessment Process as it's a central feature of society and communities in the Plan area. Contrary to the expectations of national planning policy and guidelines, a Linguistic Impact Assessment was undertaken to add to the Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p>The Plan's housing figure strikes an appropriate balance between the need to maximise the role of the Councils to respond to the evidence of the demand for new homes, the change in the local economy and the ability to demonstrate that houses could be built effectively and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>sustainably.</p> <p>Consideration was given to the objections that were submitted regarding the housing growth figure in policy PS13 of the Plan, and the view is that there were no valid reasons or clear evidence to justify reducing the housing figure in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>In preparing the distribution strategy within the Plan, the Councils considered the dispersed nature of the area against national policies for reducing the need to travel and to locate the largest growth in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology for identifying the role of various settlements and spatial distribution of the housing growth level within the Plan.</p> <p>The objector has not included any evidence which undermines the methodology used by the Councils to identify the role of the settlements or the way in which the growth figures are distributed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
290	Ms Bethan Roberts [2747]	POLICY TAI14	Object	<p>Too much houses are to be built.</p> <p>Changes to plan - Build according to the need. Would it not be better to permit Welsh speaking people to build as needed? There will be a worse influx than there is now, and the Welsh language will die sooner than it is now.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – In order to ensure that economic, social and environmental matters are considered from the start, the Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Assessment (which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment).</p> <p>The Welsh language fits in to the Sustainability Assessment Process as it's a central feature of society and communities in the Plan area. Contrary to statutory requirements and the expectations of national planning policy and guidelines, a Linguistic Assessment was undertaken to add to the Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p>The Plan's housing figure strikes an appropriate balance between the need to maximise the role of the Councils to respond to the evidence of the demand for new homes, the change in the local economy and the ability to demonstrate that houses could be built effectively and sustainably.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.13.3 of Planning Policy Wales</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>states that policies should not attempt to introduce any element of discrimination between individuals on the basis of their linguistic ability and they should attempt to control who lives in the houses for linguistic reasons.</p> <p>Any development would be considered to be contrary to policy TAI 1 'Appropriate Mix of Housing' which ensures that each new residential development contributes to the improvement of the housing balance and meets the needs identified for the whole community.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
406	Dr Richard Roberts [2938]	POLICY TAI14	Object	No evidence of local housing need which justifies the number that has been designated for Pwllheli. Building so many houses would have a detrimental impact on the Welsh language.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - in order to ensure that economic, social and environmental matters are considered from the start, the Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Assessment (which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment).</p> <p>The Welsh language fits in to the Sustainability</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>Assessment Process as it's a central feature of society and communities in the Plan area. Contrary to statutory requirements and the expectations of national planning policy and guidelines, a Linguistic Assessment was undertaken to add to the Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p>The Plan's housing figure strikes an appropriate balance between the need to maximise the role of the Councils to respond to the evidence of the demand for new homes, the change in the local economy and the ability to demonstrate that houses could be built effectively and sustainably.</p> <p>Consideration was given to the objections that were submitted regarding the housing growth figure in policy PS13 of the Plan, and the view is that there were no valid reasons or clear evidence to justify reducing the housing figure in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>In preparing the distribution strategy within the Plan, the Councils considered the dispersed nature of the area against national policies for reducing the need to travel and to locate the largest growth in sustainable locations.</p> <p>Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>Strategy' outlines the methodology for identifying the role of various settlements and spatial distribution of the housing growth level within the Plan.</p> <p>Due to the number of services / amenities located in Pwllheli, it has been identified as an Urban Service Centre which reflects the fact that it is a sustainable location. Centres such as these are popular and address the needs of a wider population within the Plan area than the individual community itself.</p> <p>The objector has not included any evidence which undermines the methodology used by the Councils to identify the role of the settlements or the way in which the growth figures have been distributed.</p> <p>Any development would be considered to be contrary to policy TAI 1 'Appropriate Mix of Housing' which ensures that each new residential development contributes to the improvement of the housing balance and meets the needs identified for the whole community.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
654	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TAI14	Object	<p>We are concerned by the high proportion of windfall sites and the relatively few allocated housing sites which means there is relatively little guidance as to where housing will be located especially in the smaller settlements. Clarification is required as to why some sites have been withdrawn and boundaries redrawn, while other boundaries have been extended even though no sites are specified.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – a high level of the historic supply within the Plan area has come from windfall sites. In reality, over the past decade, 46.3% of the growth in the Plan area has come from smaller sites (fewer than 5 houses) which have all been windfall sites.</p> <p>From the Plan’s housing figure of 7,902 units, 971 had been completed by 2014, namely 12.3%, 3,109 units are on sites designated in policies TAI 14 to TAI 16, namely 39.3%. In appendix 5 there is a reference to the land bank as at April 2014, and in disregarding the units which are unlikely to be developed and the units and housing designations which have planning permission, there are 2,025 units, which represent 25.6% of the Plan’s growth figure. This means that there is a need for 1,797 new windfall sites, namely 22.8%, to meet the Plan’s growth figure.</p> <p>The windfall growth level has been distributed at the individual settlement level.</p> <p>There are changes to the development boundaries of some settlements to ensure that</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>there are sufficient opportunities to meet their growth levels or to restrict inappropriate developments from taking place.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
753	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	POLICY TAI14	Object	<p>The policy should state that developments of more than 9 houses must include at least 10% of houses that are affordable. Developments of more than 20 houses must include at least 20% of affordable houses, developments of more than 50 houses should include 30% of affordable housing/housing association houses and developments of 100 or more should include 50% of affordable/housing association houses.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – paragraph 9.2.14 of Planning Policy Wales confirms that the community's need for affordable housing is a material planning consideration that is appropriate to be taken into account when forming development plan policies.</p> <p>However, paragraph 9.2.16 of Planning Policy Wales, in referring to setting a target for a level of affordable housing states "...The target should take account of the anticipated levels of finance available for affordable housing, including public subsidy, and the level of developer contribution that can be realistically sought...".</p> <p>In order to ensure that the affordable housing levels from market housing developments is</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>realistic, the Councils commissioned an Affordable Housing Viability Study (2013) and an update in 2014. The evidence from this work is the basis for the threshold and the percentage of affordable houses on market sites within policy TAI 9 'Affordable Housing Threshold and Distribution'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
833	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	POLICY TAI14	Object	<p>The distribution does not reflect the role, size and function of the settlements. Caernarfon only has three proposed housing sites with a total of 194 homes. In contrast the settlements of Amlwch and Llangefni which are half the size of Caernarfon, are to receive twice the level of growth from new allocations or indeed taking account of existing commitments. The Plan therefore does not provide sufficient development to allow Caernarfon to be a viable, sustainable and growing settlement (Objectives of Wales Spatial Plan and Planning Policy Wales) and indeed</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – the methodology within topic paper 5 scores the population of a settlement on the basis of the size of the population, combined with all the other facilities which are considered.</p> <p>In relation to the growth level, topic papers 4 and 4A note the various considerations which shaped the Plan's growth level and the distribution between Gwynedd and Anglesey. The anticipated transformational economic change from the unique scale of the infrastructure projects on Anglesey and the Island's status as an Enterprise Zone has</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>the Vision of the Plan for Caernarfon. We propose that additional housing of at least 400 should be directed to Caernarfon and its immediate surrounding area whilst the level of housing at Amlwch and Llangefni and local service centres should be reduced by circa 400 homes - see representation about former Friction Dynamics site.</p>	<p>influenced the growth level and the distribution between Gwynedd and Anglesey. Therefore, the growth distribution was not entirely based on population.</p> <p>From the current distribution, it is considered that Caernarfon's current role and growth figure is appropriate to address future needs.</p> <p>The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to be able to supersede the methodology which was used to identify the settlement's role. The Plan's annual monitoring report and the process of reviewing any new evidence means that Caernarfon's role and/or growth figure could be reviewed in future.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1698	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14	Support	<p>* The proposed windfall growth for these settlements may impact upon DCWW water and sewerage assets. As the location of any windfall development is not yet known we will make an assessment and</p>	<p><b>Note the observation</b> – The Councils will continue to consult DCWW at the planning application stage. Regard should also be given towards Policy PS2 and Policy ISA1 which provides the framework to ensure that the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				comment on proposed development sites at the time of the planning application.	appropriate infrastructure is in place prior to development.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1699	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14	Object	<p>* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system in the following settlements that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed:</p> <p>Bangor, Caergybi/Holyhead, Llangefni, Caernarfon, Pwllheli</p> <p>Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990. It may be necessary for modelling assessments to be undertaken to establish where the proposed development could connect to the public sewerage system.</p>	<p><b>Note the observation</b> – Policy PS2 and Policy ISA1 provides the framework to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure is in place prior to development.</p> <p>Indicator D8 in Theme 1 of the monitoring framework ensures that the Plan monitors any problem in relation to sites that have been designated in the Plan.</p> <p>However, to ensure that the expected growth levels are realised, the level of windfall permissions / developments in these settlements should be monitored against DCWW's spending programme.</p> <p>An additional indicator should be introduced in chapter 8 Theme 1 for the number of developments on windfall sites within a Sub-regional or Service Centre which are restricted by issues relating to infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>To introduce an additional indicator in chapter 8 Theme 1</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF101</b></p>
1700	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14	Object	<p>* The proposed growth being promoted within the catchment area of the following WwTW would require improvements at the treatment works:</p> <p>Bangor Treborth, Caernarfon</p> <p>The improvements would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Note the Comment</b> – Policy PS2 and Policy ISA1 provides the framework to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure is in place prior to development.</p> <p>Indicator D8 in Theme 1 of the monitoring framework ensures that the Plan monitors any problem in relation to sites that have been designated in the Plan.</p> <p>However, to ensure that the expected growth levels are realised, the level of windfall permissions / developments in these settlements should be monitored against DCWW's spending programme.</p> <p>An additional indicator should be introduced in chapter 8 Theme 1 for the number of developments on windfall sites within a Sub-regional or Service Centre which are restricted by issues relating to infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					To introduce an additional indicator in chapter 8 Theme 1  <b>Focussed Change NF101</b>

#### TAI 15 – Housing in Local Service Centres

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
50	Councillor Charles Jones [2621]	POLICY TAI15	Support	Satisfied with the way the development boundary has been drawn.	<b>Note supporting comments</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
69	Nefyn Town Council (Liz Saville Roberts) [2710]	POLICY TAI15	Object	Reduce the growth level of Nefyn to reflect the growth scale between 2001 and 2011 so that housing developments reflect local needs. Nefyn Town Council is not of the opinion that there is a need for 37 additional houses in Nefyn between now and 2016, which is the number noted in the Deposit version, March 2015. It is felt that the 30 houses on the landbank are sufficient for local need. Evidence - 21 houses were built in Nefyn between 2001 and 2011. During that period, there was a reduction of 3% in the percentage of Welsh	<b>Not accepted</b> - in order to ensure that economic, social and environmental matters are considered from the start, the Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Assessment (which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment).  The Welsh language fits in to the Sustainability Assessment Process as it's a central feature of society and communities in the Plan area. Contrary to statutory requirements and the expectations of national planning policy and guidelines, a Linguistic Assessment was



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>speakers in Nefyn. It is appreciated that there is no direct link between the percentage of Welsh speakers and housing developments, but the Council is of the opinion that a correlation exists between them in this area.</p>	<p>undertaken to add to the Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p>In terms of the Linguistic Impact Assessment / Sustainability Assessment, consideration is given to growth level in Nefyn.</p> <p>The Plan's housing figure strikes an appropriate balance between the need to maximise the role of the Councils to respond to the evidence of the demand for new homes, the change in the local economy and the ability to demonstrate that houses could be built effectively and sustainably.</p> <p>Topic paper 5, 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' introduces a methodology to identify the role of various settlements within the Plan area based on the number of services and facilities within them.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of their size, function, character, facilities, transport connections, social and environment capacity. Therefore, there will be a sustainable pattern of settlements with a viable community.</p> <p>Any housing units completed since 2011 or</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>with a planning permission, which is anticipated to be built, will count towards a settlements anticipated growth level. In light of this the existing land bank in Nefyn will contribute towards the Centres growth level.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
102	Beaumaris Town Council (Prof TW Ashenden) [1267]	POLICY TAI15	Object	<p>INCREASE ALLOCATION OF HOUSING IN BEAUMARIS AND LLANFAES</p> <p>Insufficient weight has been given to the role of the Beaumaris area as a suburb of Bangor. Demands on housing in Bangor are driven by the economic success of Bangor and the A55 corridor to the east. As a result the balance of housing allocation between the centres of Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch and Beaumaris inappropriately favours Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch with a result that the current shortage of affordable housing in Beaumaris will be made worse. A greater allocation of housing should be made to the</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - topic paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology to identify the role of different settlements and spatial distribution of housing growth level within the Plan.</p> <p>Beaumaris is identified as a Local Service Centre and its growth level reflects this.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the services and facilities in Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch, they have been identified as Urban Service Centres and their growth level reflects this role and the fact that policy PS15 distributes 55% of the Plan's growth to the Sub-Regional Centre / Urban Service Centres.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>Beaumaris/Llanfaes area.</p> <p>Some of the allocation of new housing to Holyhead, Llangefni and Amlwch should be redirected to Beaumaris.</p>	<p>The objector has not included any evidence which undermines the methodology used by the Councils to identify the role of the settlements or the way in which the growth figures have been distributed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
316	Mr Paul Green [2908]	POLICY TAI15	Object	<p>The allocation of development to Llanfairpwll, Menai Bridge, Llandegfan and Beaumaris should reflect their connection to the Bangor regional hub. Some of the housing currently allocated to Holyhead, Amlwch and Llangefni should be allocated to the settlements along the Menai Strait.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - topic paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology to identify the role of different settlements and spatial distribution of housing growth level within the Plan.</p> <p>Beaumaris, Llanfairpwll and Menai Bridge are identified as Local Service Centres, while Llandegfan is a Local Village and its growth level reflects this.</p> <p>Due to the nature of the services and facilities in Caergybi, Llangefni and Amlwch, they have been identified as Urban Service Centres and their growth level reflects this role and the fact</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>that policy PS15 distributes 55% of the Plan's growth to the Sub-Regional Centre / Urban Service Centres.</p> <p>The objector has not included any evidence which undermines the methodology used by the Councils to identify the role of the settlements or the way in which the growth figures have been distributed.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
522	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TAI15	Object	<p>Surprised that no new housing sites are proposed in Bethesda, with 82 houses to be met through 'windfall'. The GUDP site Nr Maes Coetmor, which we understand has been consented, is outside the development boundary. Did not consider this a suitable site because of the density and inadequate access. Oppose housing (SP633) to the green open fields to the north, comprising high quality agricultural land and contribute to ribbon development. We would support housing</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Plan's spatial strategy distributes the overall demand for housing units across the settlements based upon their role in the settlement hierarchy. After identifying a settlements anticipated growth level a review was undertaken over the contribution to this growth level from units already built and those with planning permission.</p> <p>During the period 2011 to 2014, 18 housing units were completed within the centre, also in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>on a number of centrally situated brownfield sites, subject to resolution of any flooding problems.</p> <p>Why no housing sites? Why is GUDP site excluded from boundary?</p>	<p>April 2014 there was planning permission for 28 Housing units. This means that 54 Units were required over the remainder of the Plan period in 2015 (when the Deposit Plan was published) to address the expected growth level in Bethesda.</p> <p>After identifying what the contribution could be from units with planning permission a study was undertaken of the capacity within the built form to meet the remaining need. The work within Topic Paper 6 Urban Capacity Study considers a previous contribution of windfall sites in order to project growth opportunities for the future together with opportunities for empty housing to come back into use. For the purpose of the Plan, usually a 75% urban capacity figure has been used to take into consideration a potential further slippage within this category. The outcomes of Topic Paper 6 for Bethesda were that there were opportunities for 54 windfall units in the centre.</p> <p>Because of this, there was no need to designate the site in the UDP to address Bethesda's expected growth level.</p> <p>Reference was made to site SP633 by the objector, however this is a site in Bangor, and it</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>is believed that the objector is referring to site SP663 which is a site in Bethesda. Topic Paper 1A 'Assessing Candidate Sites' confirms that this site has not been included because there are enough units in the existing land bank as well as windfall opportunities to address the settlement's housing growth level.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
754	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	POLICY TAI15	Object	<p>TAI15 should state that developments of more than 9 houses must include at least 10% of houses that are affordable. Developments of more than 20 houses must include at least 20% of affordable houses, developments of more than 50 houses should include 30% of affordable housing/housing association houses and developments of 100 or more should include 50% of affordable/housing association houses.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – paragraph 9.2.14 of Planning Policy Wales confirms that the community's need for <b>affordable housing</b> is a material planning consideration that is appropriate to be taken into account when forming development plan policies.</p> <p>However, paragraph 9.2.16 of Planning Policy Wales, in referring to setting a target for a level of affordable housing states "...The target should take account of the anticipated levels of finance available for affordable housing, including public subsidy, and the level of developer contribution that can be realistically</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>sought...”.</p> <p>In order to ensure that the affordable housing level from market housing developments is realistic, the Councils commissioned an Affordable Housing Viability Study (2013) and an update in 2014. The evidence from this work is the basis for the threshold and the percentage of affordable houses on market sites within policy TAI 9 ‘Affordable Housing Threshold and Distribution’.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1431	Penrhyddeudraeth Town Council (Mr Glyn Roberts) [1261]	POLICY TAI15	Object	Alarm bells should be ringing clearly and urgently given that there was only a 2.2% increase in the number of Welsh speakers between 2001 and 2011 in Penrhyndeudraeth, that the population aged between 20- 29 has fallen by 6.1%, whilst the 65 and over age group has risen by 16% and that the number of migrants has risen from 169 to 242 (+43,2%) between 1991 and 2001. (An analysis of	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - due to a flood problem affecting Porthmadog and Tremadog, a higher than expected level of growth has been distributed to Penrhyndeudraeth and Criccieth which are Local Service Centres within the Porthmadog catchment area.</p> <p>The spatial strategy, which has been informed by the Sustainability Appraisal, will ensure that developments will be directed to locations that</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>2001 - 2011 figures would have shown an even higher increase). The status of the Welsh language in Penrhyndeudraeth isn't at a point where one can be reassured any more. That there are inconsistencies and contradictions and an inability to recognise the significance of statistics can't be avoided.</p>	<p>are sustainable in relation to size, function, and character, facilities, and transport connections, social and environmental capacity. Therefore, there will be a sustainable pattern of settlements with a vibrant community.</p> <p>The Plan's Linguistic Impact Assessment / Sustainability Appraisal has assessed the impact of a higher level of growth for Penrhyndeudraeth. The findings of the Linguistic Impact Assessment / Sustainability Appraisal are as follows; it is possible to attract a larger than expected proportion of houses to the settlement. Reference is made to strategic and detailed policies that will control development in the settlement, through facilitating adequate provision of affordable housing for local need, an appropriate mix of types of houses, and that the development is a phased development. There could also be opportunities to promote the upgrading of community facilities and services in light of the development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<b>No Change</b>
1695	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15	Support	* The proposed windfall growth for these settlements may impact upon DCWW water and sewerage assets. As the location of any windfall development is not yet known we will make an assessment and comment on proposed development sites at the time of the planning application.	<b>Note the comment</b> - The Councils will continue to co-operate with the company in the preparation of a relevant supplementary planning guidance and consult with the company at the planning application stage. Regard should also be given towards Policy PS2 and Policy ISA1 which provides the framework to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure is in place prior to development.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1696	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system in the following settlements that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed:  Beaumaris, Benllech, Bethesda, Gaerwen, Llanfairpwll, Rhosneigr, Valley, Abermaw/Barmouth, Abersoch, Llanberis, Llanrug, Nefyn, Penygroes and Tywyn.  Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator	<b>Note the Comment</b> – Policies PS2 and ISA1 within the Plan refers to circumstances when there will be a requirement for a specific development to provide a contribution towards essential infrastructure.  Indicator D8 in Theme 1 of the monitoring framework ensures that the Plan monitors any problem in relation to sites that have been designated in the Plan.  However, to ensure that the expected growth levels are realised, the level of windfall

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990. It may be necessary for modelling assessments to be undertaken to establish where the proposed development could connect to the public sewerage system.</p>	<p>permissions / developments in these settlements should be monitored against DCWW's spending programme.</p> <p>An additional indicator should be introduced in chapter 8 Theme 1 for the number of developments on windfall sites within a Sub-regional or Service Centre which are restricted by issues relating to infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To introduce an additional indicator in chapter 8 Theme 1</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF101</b></p>
1697	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15	Object	<p>* The proposed growth being promoted within the catchment area of the following WwTW would require improvements at the treatment works:</p> <p>Beaumaris, Cemaes, Porthaethwy/Menai Bridge (Bangor Treborth), Pentraeth, Rhosneigr &amp; Criccieth.</p> <p>The improvements would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Note the Comment</b> – Policies PS2 and ISA1 within the Plan refers to circumstances when there will be a requirement for a specific development to provide a contribution towards essential infrastructure.</p> <p>Indicator D8 in Theme 1 of the monitoring framework ensures that the Plan monitors any problem in relation to sites that have been designated in the Plan.</p> <p>However, to ensure that the expected growth levels are realised, the level of windfall</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>permissions / developments in these settlements should be monitored against DCWW's spending programme.</p> <p>An additional indicator should be introduced in chapter 8 Theme 1 for the number of developments on windfall sites within a Sub-regional or Service Centre which are restricted by issues relating to infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To introduce an additional indicator in chapter 8 Theme 1</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF101</b></p>

#### TAI 16 – Housing in Service Villages

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
211	LLANBEDROG COMMUNITY COUNCIL (MR JOHN HARRIS) [2810]	POLICY TAI16	Object	Recommend that Llanbedrog is included as a servicing village / centre. Llanbedrog scores 28 points on topic paper 5, one less than Botwnnog. Llanbedrog has a school, a village hall, shops, a garage, pubs, a cafe, hotels, a gallery and arts centre, a golf course, an industrial estate, older people's homes, a chemist - almost as much services as Abersoch.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - all facilities mentioned by the objector, except for the home for the elderly and the golf course, have received a score in topic paper 5.</p> <p>The standard methodology used to assess the role of settlements does not identify businesses such as a home for the elderly and the golf course as an individual service to receive a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>score; however, jobs in these will go towards the employment score of the dwelling.</p> <p>Table 9 in Topic Paper 5 shows that there a large number of settlements are within a few marks from each other. One consideration when assessing a Service Village's more strategic role compared with other Villages was how many Key Services are in the Village and there are 5 of these in Botwnnog's case 5 compared with 3 in Llanbedrog.</p> <p>Therefore, on these grounds the objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to justify support to change Llanbedrog's status in the settlement tree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
364	Mrs Gwyneth Evans [2887]	POLICY TAI16	Support	I would like to support the Cae Cefn Capel, Botwnnog site. I believe that Botwnnog is an ideal village to expand as there are so many facilities here e.g. a primary school and a secondary school (save	<p><b>Note supporting comments</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				transportation costs as there is a pavement all the way from the site to both schools) a surgery, a post office, a cafe, a church and a chapel.	
423	Dr Richard Roberts [2938]	POLICY TAI16	Object	No evidence of local housing need which justifies the number designated for Chwillog and Y Ffôr. Building this much houses would have a detrimental impact on the Welsh language.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - in order to ensure that economic, social and environmental matters are considered from the start, the Plan has been subject to a Sustainability Assessment (which incorporates a Strategic Environmental Assessment).</p> <p>The Welsh language fits in to the Sustainability Assessment Process as it's a central feature of society and communities in the Plan area. Contrary to statutory requirements and the expectations of national planning policy and guidelines, a Linguistic Assessment was undertaken to add to the Sustainability Assessment.</p> <p>In terms of the Linguistic Impact Assessment / Sustainability Assessment, consideration is given to growth level in Chwillog and Y Ffôr.</p> <p>The Plan's housing figure strikes an appropriate balance between the need to maximise the role of the Councils to respond to the evidence of the demand for new homes, the change in the local economy and the ability to demonstrate that houses could be built effectively and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>sustainably.</p> <p>Topic paper 5, 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' introduces a methodology to identify the role of various settlements within the Plan area based on the number of services and facilities within them.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is directed to locations that are sustainable in terms of their size, function, character, facilities, transport connections, social and environment capacity. Therefore, there will be a sustainable pattern of settlements with a viable community.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
627	Carter Jonas (Mrs Charlene Sussums-Lewis) [2829]	POLICY TAI16	Support	<p>The proposed allocation of circa 30 residential units on Site T66 (Land near Maes Bleddyn Rachub) is supported for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Deliverability - the site is under single</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comments</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>ownership.</p> <p>2. Allocated Housing Numbers - residential allocations in Service Centres will count towards the delivery of housing growth.</p> <p>3. Development Principle - T66 can accommodate 30 dwellings over the plan period.</p> <p>4. Opportunities and Constraints - the plan demonstrates that the site is feasible.</p> <p>5. Indicative Masterplan- the site could be developed with minimal impacts.</p> <p>6. Positive Sustainability Appraisal - the site is in accordance with the plan strategy.</p>	
1701	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16	Support	<p>* The proposed windfall growth for these settlements may impact upon DCWW water and sewerage assets. As the location of any windfall development is not yet known we will make an assessment and comment on proposed development sites at the time of the planning application.</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comments</b> – The Councils will continue to co-operate with the company in the preparation of a relevant supplementary planning guidance and consult with the company at the planning application stage. Regard should also be given towards Policy PS2 and Policy ISA1 which provides the framework to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure is in place prior to development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<b>No Change</b>
1702	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16	Object	<p>* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system in the following settlements that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed:</p> <p>Newborough</p> <p>Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990.</p>	<p><b>Note comments</b> – the only housing designation in the village (T56) has planning permission already.</p> <p>An additional indicator should be introduced in chapter 8 Theme 1 for the number of developments on windfall sites within a Sub-regional or Service Centre which are restricted by issues relating to infrastructure.</p> <p>Policies PS2 and ISA1 within the Plan refers to circumstances when there will be a requirement for a specific development to provide a contribution towards essential infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To introduce an additional indicator in chapter 8 Theme 1</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF101</b></p>
1703	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16	Object	<p>* The proposed growth being promoted within the catchment area of the following WwTW would require improvements at the treatment works:</p>	<p><b>Note the Comment</b> – Policies PS2 and ISA1 within the Plan refers to circumstances when there will be a requirement for a specific development to provide a contribution towards essential infrastructure.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>Llanerchymedd, Bethel (Treborth Bangor WwTW), Bontnewydd (Llanfaglan WwTW), Rachub (Bethesda WwTW).</p> <p>The improvements would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p>Indicator D8 in Theme 1 of the monitoring framework ensures that the Plan monitors any problem in relation to sites that have been designated in the Plan.</p> <p>However, to ensure that the expected growth levels are realised, the level of windfall permissions / developments in these settlements should be monitored against DCWW's spending programme.</p> <p>An additional indicator should be introduced in chapter 8 Theme 1 for the number of developments on windfall sites within a Sub-regional or Service Centre which are restricted by issues relating to infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To introduce an additional indicator in chapter 8 Theme 1</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF101</b></p>

**TAI 17 – Housing in Local, Rural & Coastal Villages**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
95	Elizabeth Whitehead [2742]	POLICY TAI17	Support	<p>Confirm support subject to correct interpretation-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Planning applications must conform to all points of TAI17.</li> <li>* Development is restricted to within outline boundaries (map 55)</li> <li>* Preference is given to Sustainable living SO5 - whilst respecting the varied role and character of the centres, villages and countryside.</li> <li>* Preference is given to protect and enhance the natural and built environment SO16 - Protect, enhance and manage the natural and heritage assets of the Plan area, including its natural resources, wildlife habitats, and its landscape character.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Note supporting comments</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
200	Rhys Thomas [2738]	POLICY TAI17	Support	<p>I support the proposal to restrict development to WITHIN the development boundary for Llangristiolus as shown on the interactive map, being a Local Village as defined within STRATEGIC POLICY PS15: Local Villages:</p> <p>"Development will be restricted to a scale and type to address community need for housing on windfall/ infill plots WITHIN DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES."</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comments</b></p> <p>For clarity it should be noted that policy TAI 10 'Exception Sites' can support a scheme for affordable housing on sites immediately adjacent to development boundaries.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
209	John Brinley Jones	POLICY	Object	Llanbedrog should be classed as a Service	<b>Not accepted</b> - all facilities mentioned by the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
	[2087]	TAI17		<p>Village and not as a Coastal Village. Llanbedrog has many services since Pen Y Berth is also within the parish of Llanbedrog. Llanbedrog should be encouraged to grow and be successful but if it is categorised as a Coastal Village then it will have an unfair disadvantage against other villages in Dwyfor.</p> <p>Remove Llanbedrog from the list of Coastal Village and add it to the list of Service Village</p>	<p>objector, except for the home for the elderly and the golf course, have received a score in topic paper 5.</p> <p>The standard methodology used to assess the role of settlements does not identify businesses such as a home for the elderly and the golf course as an individual service to receive a score; however, jobs in these will go towards the employment score of the dwelling.</p> <p>Table 9 in Topic Paper 5 shows that there is a large number of settlements are within a few marks from each other. One consideration when assessing a Service Village's more strategic role compared with other Villages was how many Key Services are in the Village.</p> <p>Therefore, on these grounds the objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to justify support to change Llanbedrog's status in the settlement tree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
212	LLANBEDROG COMMUNITY COUNCIL (MR JOHN HARRIS) [2810]	POLICY TAI17	Object	<p>Object to Llanbedrog's designation as a Coastal village and wish to see it included as a Service Village. Recommend that Llanbedrog is included as a service village. Llanbedrog scores 28 points on topic paper 5, one less than Botwnnog. Llanbedrog has a school, a village hall, shops, a garage, pubs, a cafe, hotels, a gallery and arts centre, a golf course, an industrial estate, homes for older people, a chemist. Almost as much services as Abersoch. The village boundary was shrivelled last time, and it is needed to expand the boundary. A flexible boundary is required to address local housing need, not necessarily affordable housing only. Not everyone wants the strict conditions of affordable housing.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - all facilities mentioned by the objector, except for the home for the elderly and the golf course, have received a score in topic paper 5.</p> <p>The standard methodology used to assess the role of settlements does not identify businesses such as a home for the elderly and the golf course as an individual service to receive a score; however, jobs in these will go towards the employment score of the dwelling.</p> <p>Table 9 in Topic Paper 5 shows that there is a large number of settlements are within a few marks from each other. One consideration when assessing a Service Village's more strategic role compared with other Villages was how many Key Services are in the Village and there are 5 of these in Botwnnog's case compared with 3 in Llanbedrog.</p> <p>Therefore, on these grounds the objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to justify support to change Llanbedrog's status in the settlement tree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
616	Cater Jonas (Mr Chris Bell) [3041]	POLICY TAI17	Object	<p>Objection to the restriction of growth in Tregarth to 13 windfall dwellings over the plan period and the drawing of the development boundary. Objection to the sustainability assessment for Tregarth (settlement score). The current approach actually puts at risk the viability of local services.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - all facilities mentioned by the objector have received a score in topic paper 5.</p> <p>In preparing the distribution strategy within the Plan, the Council considered the dispersed nature of the area against national policies for reducing the need to travel and to locate the largest growth in sustainable locations.</p> <p>It is felt that distribution in the Deposit Plan has created a suitable balance between national policy and the local situation. Whilst a high growth level of growth in some locations can help somewhat with some local services, having a relaxed development boundary and a higher growth level would possibly lead to other problems within some communities e.g. impact on the Welsh language etc. The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to be able to justify supporting an application to change Tregarth's status in the settlement tree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
634	Secretary of State for Defence [3045]	POLICY TAI17	Object	<p>Inadequate social and community facilities within the Llanfihangel yn Nhowyn settlement to support the current housing stock. Residents rely on base facilities at RAF Valley for these facilities. This has resulted in increasing volumes of vehicular/pedestrian traffic leading to a number of traffic 'near misses'. The Council shouldn't rely on the base facilities to serve the local community and its growth, particularly if problems continue.</p> <p>Change: amend wording to encourage the establishment of additional community facilities to serve LyN and to prevent any further growth of the village unless the range and scale of supporting facilities is increased.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – topic paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology to categorise Villages.</p> <p>Services / facilities within Llanfihangel yn Nhowyn or within 800 metres in the case of Schools, were identified and they received a score. Based on this score, an expected growth level was identified for the Village.</p> <p>It must be borne in mind that a number of houses in Llanfihangel yn Nhowyn have been in the RAF's ownership before they were sold as houses on the local market.</p> <p>The plan in policy ISA 2 'Community Facilities' supports appropriate plans for community facilities and policy MAN 2 'Retailing outside defined town centres but within development boundaries' supports proposals for new small-scale convenience stores.</p> <p>The Council is unaware of transport problems with the Village. However, transport matters will be a relevant consideration with any</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>specific application in the Village and the authority's Highways Service will give their opinion on the proposal.</p> <p>If a specific problem is identified, then this will be a matter to be considered when undertaking the Plan's annual monitoring plan and any review of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
708	Carter Jonas (Mrs Charlene Sussums-Lewis) [2829]	POLICY TAI17	Support	<p>The proposed development boundary alteration for the inclusion of Site East of A466 (SP678) Llanaelhaearn is supported for the following reasons:</p> <p>Deliverability - Positive Planning  Allocated Housing Numbers  Development Principle  Opportunities and Constraints - As attached in Appendix 1  Indicative Masterplan - As attached in Appendix 2  Positive Sustainability Appraisal</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comments</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
709	Carter Jonas (Mrs Charlene Sussums-Lewis) [2829]	POLICY TAI17	Object	<p>Open Market Housing to be permitted in Local/Coastal/Rural Villages.</p> <p>The policy should contain a definition of what 'community need' means.</p> <p>Sites within such villages are at a disadvantage to sites under policy TAI 10 in that open market housing is not allowed under policy TAI 17.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – the policy does not limit growth to affordable housing only. Paragraph 7.4.124 refers to limiting housing development to a type and scale that satisfies the community need for housing. It continues to note that there is support for housing or affordable housing for local need.</p> <p>Therefore, open market housing which addresses the community's need for housing can be supported.</p> <p>This reflects the character and role of Villages identified under policy TAI 17 and ties-in with policy TAI 1 to have an appropriate mix of housing.</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Affordable Housing will provide an explanation on community need.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
731	RCH Douglas	POLICY	Object	Objection to the restriction of growth in	<b>Not accepted</b> - All facilities mentioned by the



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
& 733	Pennant [3070]	TAI17		Llandygai to 8 windfall dwellings over the plan period and the drawing of the development boundary. Objection to the sustainability assessment for Llandygai (settlement score). The current approach actually puts at risk the viability of local services. Changes: a wider development boundary to permit an increased number of dwellings in Llandygai, which would better support the local services.	<p>objector have received a score in topic paper 5.</p> <p>In preparing the distribution strategy within the Plan, the Council considered the dispersed nature of the area against national policies for reducing the need to travel and to locate the largest growth in sustainable locations.</p> <p>It is felt that distribution in the Deposit Plan has created a suitable balance between national policy and the local situation. Whilst a high growth level of growth in some locations can help somewhat with some local services, having a relaxed development boundary and a higher growth level would possibly lead to other problems within some communities e.g. impact on the Welsh language etc. The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to be able to justify supporting an application to change Llandygai's status in the settlement tree.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
764	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	POLICY TAI17	Object	<p>Providing only affordable housing within Local, Rural and Coastal Villages will weaken communities socially and economically, increasing deprivation. National Policy requires a mix of affordable and market housing. Restricting development to 100% affordable housing will lead to social imbalance.</p> <p>Only allowing local need or affordable housing in certain settlements is likely to ensure a failure to deliver the required level of housing. Local need and affordable housing can only be achieved through balanced, viable development (incorporating open market and affordable housing).</p> <p>Alter policy to provide a mix of affordable and open market housing within Local, Rural and Coastal Villages.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – the policy does not limit growth to affordable housing only. Paragraph 7.4.124 refers to limiting housing development to a type and scale that satisfies the community need for housing. It continues to note that there is support for housing or affordable housing for local need.</p> <p>Therefore, open market housing which addresses the community's need for housing can be supported.</p> <p>This reflects the character and role of Villages identified under policy TAI 17 and ties-in with policy TAI 1 to have an appropriate mix of housing.</p> <p>An element of expected growth level within these Villages has already been provided by means of completed units since 2011 and a percentage of them now has an existing permission. The Plan's annual monitoring system will highlight if the anticipated level for this tier of the hierarchy has not been delivered, or if there is a risk of too many being granted permission.</p> <p>The number of existing affordable housing in the Villages at present is believed to be very limited with a number of them only consisting</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>of market housing. Providing affordable housing in the Plan period will lead to a better mixture of housing than the present situation in these Villages.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
832	Jina Gwyrfai [3092]	POLICY TAI17	Object	<p>Here is a policy that can defend small local communities. Shouldn't criteria i) &amp; ii) be the basis for the whole Plan? Having said that a clearer definition of 'affordable housing' is required in the context of community. 67% can't afford the cheapest house due to poor wages (much lower than in other areas). More "Tai Teg" rented housing is required rather than houses for sale. This policy should form the basis of all planning apart from Bangor/ Holyhead the sub-regional centres. Restrict house building to natural change.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – clause i) and ii) reflect the character and role of Villages identified under policy TAI 17.</p> <p>Topic paper 5, 'Developing the settlement strategy' identifies the role of various types of centres and the type of development that could be expected within them.</p> <p>As the sub-regional centre and other service centres have a number of services and facilities, they are sustainable locations. They are also popular to address the needs of a wider population within the Plan's area, rather than its own individual community. In light of this it is not believed that the growth levels in such settlements should be limited to only meet</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>their own community needs.</p> <p>Policy TAI 1 refers to an appropriate mix of housing and more rented housing can be supported with a proposal if the relevant evidence justifies this.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1188	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI17	Support	<p>There are no known water supply issues to impact upon the delivery of the growth identified within these settlements, however a full assessment will be made at the time of a planning application once the location of development is known. The adequacy of the sewerage network will be assessed at the time of a planning application once the location of development is known.</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comments</b> – the Councils will continue to consult with the company at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
202	John Brinley Jones [2087]	7.4.124	Object	<p>How was the figure 16 new dwellings for Llanbedrog calculated. Does this figure include all types of new dwellings including holiday homes. A survey conducted in 2007 for Llanbedrog Parish Council concluded</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – topic paper 5 ‘Developing the Settlement Strategy’ outlines the methodology to identify the growth level which is based on the type of facilities available in the Village.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>that 28 families wanted to move into the village. 10 affordable homes were built but apparently these 10 have already been included in the figure and another 3 that are holiday homes have also been included leaving on 1 to be built in Llanbedrog over the plans lifetime which is not enough considering that we would like to see some more growth in Llanbedrog.</p> <p>Increase number from 16 to at least 28 and this figure should not include second or holiday homes. Change Table 20 relating to explanation paragraph 7.4.124 - Indicative growth level in coastal villages from 16 to 28 and state figures should not include holiday / second homes. Perhaps reduce dwellings required in Pwllheli by 12 and add them to Llanbedrog.</p>	<p>Any development that has taken place in a settlement since April 2011 counts towards the Plan's growth figure.</p> <p>Under policy TAI 5 'Local Market Housing', that has identified Llanbedrog as an appropriate Village in this policy, any market house will be limited to a local market house. This will lessen the risk that any new housing units will be used as a holiday / second home.</p> <p>If there is robust evidence that a higher level of affordable housing is needed in the Village, then this can be supported by means of policy TAI 10 'Exception sites'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
210	LLANBEDROG COMMUNITY COUNCIL (MR JOHN HARRIS) [2810]	7.4.124	Object	To increase the growth level of Llanbedrog from 16 to 28 units. In 2007 the Council undertook a review of the need for housing in Llanbedrog, and it became apparent that there was a need for 28 houses. 12 affordable houses were built, which leaves	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – topic paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology to identify the growth level which is based on the type of facilities available in the Village.</p> <p>Any development that has taken place in a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				16 as destitute. In the Plan there is no provision for this. Does this figure include second homes?	<p>settlement since April 2011 counts towards the Plan's growth figure.</p> <p>Under policy TAI 5 'Local Market Housing', that has identified Llanbedrog as an appropriate Village in this policy, any market house will be limited to a local market house. This will lessen the risk that any new housing units will be used as a holiday / second home.</p> <p>If there is robust evidence that a higher level of affordable housing is needed in the Village, then this can be supported by means of policy TAI 10 'Exception sites'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
213	LLANBEDROG COMMUNITY COUNCIL (MR JOHN HARRIS) [2810]	7.4.124	Object	The restrictions placed on Coastal/Rural villages are too strict. It is important to have growth. It is important to have growth to safeguard the village's character, in order to enable a variety of local need housing to be built, and not necessarily only affordable housing.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – topic paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' highlights the methodology to identify the growth level which is based on the type of facilities available in the Coastal / Rural Village. Therefore, all villages in the Coastal / Rural category (except for Fairbourne which has not been issued a growth</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>level due to a future sea level problem) have been issued a growth level.</p> <p>The policy does not limit growth to affordable housing only. Paragraph 7.4.124 refers to limiting housing development to a type and scale that satisfies the community need for housing. It continues to note that there is support for housing or affordable housing for local need.</p> <p>Therefore, open market housing which addresses the community's need for housing can be supported.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### TAI 18 – Housing in Clusters

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
383	Mr Emyr Jones [2935]	POLICY TAI18	Object	This policy defines the village of Llanfaes as a cluster. A more appropriate categorisation would be as a local village, given its size and characteristics. There are discrepancies in the assessment process	<b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology to identify the role of different centres within the Plan.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>which has been carried out, given that Talwrn for example, a settlement similar in characteristics to Llanfaes, has been defined as a local village. There is a need for both affordable and market housing in Llanfaes to support and develop local services. The site identified as SP49 in the Candidate Site Register would be a suitable site for small scale expansion of the village.</p>	<p>In order to distinguish between a Village and a Cluster, 9 specific facilities were identified as being essential, and are those defined by the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. To ensure consistency and higher levels of growth in a more sustainable centre, at least one of these key facilities was essential.</p> <p>Llanfaes has none of these specific facilities and the objector has not demonstrated any evidence to the contrary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
442	Mr B Pritchard [2951]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>The village of Brynteg has not been included within any classification characterised as being capable of receiving new housing development. This is an oversight as the village displays many of the characteristics associated with other local villages and clusters. Talwrn for example, a similar village, has been classified as a local village. It is essential for the social and economic well-being of</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>In order to distinguish between a Village and a Cluster, 9 specific facilities were identified as being essential, and are those defined by the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. To ensure consistency and higher levels of growth in a</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				Brynteg that new development is promoted and such a designation given. There are suitable sites for such development within the village, including site ref SP162 in the list of Candidate sites.	<p>more sustainable centre, at least one of these key facilities was essential.</p> <p>Brynteg has none of these specific facilities and the objector has not demonstrated any evidence to the contrary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
497	Tref Alaw Community Council (Miss Anna M Jones) [1402]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>Item 6 within the paragraph states that occupancy is restricted in perpetuity.</p> <p>This will result in it being impossible to obtain a mortgage on the dwelling.</p> <p>The Plan intends to 'empty' the countryside of residents and create ghettos in the towns.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Plan's strategy acknowledges the area's dispersed nature which is reflected in the settlement hierarchy and the Clusters category</p> <p>Due to the national emphasis of Planning Policy Wales to locate developments sustainably, housing policy TAI 18 restricts developments entirely to affordable units as there are only a few facilities in these Clusters.</p> <p>The use of legal agreements to restrict occupancy is a method supported by National Policy. While the policy promotes affordable use in perpetuity, there will be a clause</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>regarding the sale of the house on the open market in cases where the lending company repossesses the house and is unable to let it to someone who satisfies the agreement. This will help individuals to be granted a mortgage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
574	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>* Clusters should be upgraded as a settlement to include a development boundary's</p> <p>* There should be a specific housing allocation to deliver a combination of open market and affordable housing to meet the actual local need for such dwellings</p> <p>* The identified clusters are generally sustainable settlements with good transport links. The clusters should not be limited in their growth as additional community services and facilities would be supported thereafter.</p> <p>* This will support the needs of local communities which formally supported a number of services and facilities</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – the Plan has identified a number of cohesive clusters of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre on a bus route, or within 800 meters of a bus stop, and in some cases with some facilities / services.</p> <p>In line with the sustainability principles which influence the Plan’s spatial strategy it is not considered that these are appropriate locations to be designated as housing sites with a higher level of growth; the growth level of 2 affordable units for the cluster will provide suitable opportunities to meet the needs arising from the local community.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>throughout the year; more suitably that an overly onerous policy which restricts the number of dwellings to be built to two and would reduce the impact of the concentration of holiday accommodation.</p> <p>* It is considered that providing only 2 affordable dwellings within clusters will weaken communities both socially and economically resulting in an increase in deprivation. It is identified within National Planning Policy that there is a requirement to provide a mix of affordable and market housing within settlements in order to create and maintain sustainable communities. Restricting housing development to 100% affordable housing will result in the social imbalance of settlements and therefore contrary to national planning policy.</p>	<p>It is considered that the number of affordable houses in these Clusters are currently very low, with the majority only having open market housing. Restricting any further development during the lifetime of the Plan would bring a better mix to the existing situation of these Clusters. Also promoting only affordable dwellings in Clusters is consistent with national planning policy and the guidance in TAN6.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
648	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	POLICY TAI 18	Object	<p>Policy PS15 - Settlement Strategy - restricts coastal villages to "within development boundaries in-fill or windfall sites". An indicative potential of 10 such sites is allocated to Borth y Gest. It is noted that this is neither a target or limit.</p> <p>I support this element of the policy especially "Development will be restricted to a scale and type to address community</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>In order to distinguish between a Village and a Cluster, 9 specific facilities were identified as being essential, and are those defined by the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. To ensure consistency and higher levels of growth in a more sustainable centre, at least one of these</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>need for housing on windfall/infill plots within development boundaries. No open market housing sites will be allocated in these villages."</p> <p>However, the need in Borth y Gest on in-fill sites is for affordable housing and not for open market. Change Borth-Y-Gest to a Cluster.</p>	<p>key facilities was essential.</p> <p>As there is a Primary School in Borth-y-Gest it has been identified as a Coastal / Rural Village.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
702 & 703	RCH Douglas Pennant [3070]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>Objection to the restriction of growth in Talybont to 2 windfall dwellings over the plan period and the absence of a development boundary. Objection to the sustainability assessment for Talybont (settlement score). The current approach actually puts at risk the viability of local services. Change: a development boundary to permit an increased number of dwellings in Talybont, which would better support the local services.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>In order to distinguish between a Village and a Cluster, 9 specific facilities were identified as being essential, and are those defined by the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. To ensure consistency and higher levels of growth in a more sustainable centre, at least one of these key facilities was essential.</p> <p>In line with the sustainability principles which influence the Plan's spatial strategy it is not considered that these are appropriate locations to be designated as housing sites with a higher</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>level of growth; the growth level of 2 affordable units for the cluster will provide suitable opportunities to meet the needs arising from the local community. Also promoting only affordable dwellings in Clusters is consistent with national planning policy and the guidance in TAN6.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
732	Llanystumdwy Community Council (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>Pencaenewydd and Rhoslan have been included in the clusters table.</p> <p>Why is Llanarmon not included? It has been included as a rural village in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan and we feel that it should be included again as a cluster. After all, it has a Church and the same bus service that serves Pencaenewydd and Llangybi runs through the village.</p> <p>Llanarmon should be included in table 21.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive group of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.</p> <p>There is no cohesive group of 10 or more houses in Llanarmon, while there are</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>approximately 40 in Pencaenewydd and 30 in Rhoslan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
736	Llanengan Community Council (Ms Einir Wyn) [1548]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>It makes no sense that a village as large as Llanengan, with a pub, chapel, church and busy social centre (where the Ysgol Feithrin is held) is considered a cluster like Sarn Bach and Machroes. Local need homes have been built in the village over the last five/six years and there is room for further infill - there is an application submitted at the moment. Six affordable/local need homes have already been approved.</p> <p>This classification should be reconsidered as a rural village in order to allow a four affordable / local need homes in Llanengan during the LDP's lifetime rather than the two that are allowed as a cluster.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>In order to distinguish between a Village and a Cluster, 9 specific facilities were identified as being essential, and are those defined by the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. To ensure consistency and higher levels of growth in a more sustainable centre, at least one of these key facilities was essential.</p> <p>Llanengan has none of these specific facilities and therefore it has been categorised as a Cluster in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
970	Councillor Elwyn Edwards [399]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>I feel that the proposed plan regarding the amount of affordable housing approved for local need is insufficient as it stands (2 houses) over the life of the plan (up to 2026). I would like to change the wording of the amount of housing to (As Required) over the plan period rather than 2.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - in order to distribute the growth level of the Plan, a growth estimate must be given for the Clusters tier, which is 2 units in each Cluster.</p> <p>The Plan's annual monitoring system will enable us to review what is happening within this tier. There might be a greater need within some clusters than others, and dependent upon appropriate evidence to justify this need, a higher level of growth beyond 2 units might be supported in some Clusters.</p> <p>However, if the annual monitoring work shows that the level is considerably higher within the overall Clusters tier, this could lead to a review of the Plan's Housing Distribution.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<b>No Change</b>
1094	Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY TAI18	Support	NRW welcomes that housing within the rural clusters will be 100% affordable housing.	<b>Note supporting comments</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1272	Mr & Mrs O R & M Roberts [2955]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rhostrehwfa is named as a cluster, this site is infill between Llangefni and Rhostrehwfa</li> <li>2. The infill area should be incorporated within either the Rhostrehwfa or Llangefni and is infill between the relevant inset maps</li> <li>3. A cluster is 10 no of units or more and this area exceeds there required numbers</li> <li>4. The whole area from inset map Rhostrehwfa and Llangefni should be amended, to reflect a cluster in TAI18.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive group of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.</p> <p>There is no cohesive group of 10 or more houses in the area which the objector wishes to be included in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
1277, 1278 & 1279	Llandderfel Community Council (Mrs Bethan Jones) [1257]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>We object to the proposal to limit the maximum to two units per cluster for the life of the Plan. It would be better to permit units according to demand and permit the number of affordable housing units as required for local people. There should also be the ability to extend the boundary as required to ensure there are sites for local people on their own land.</p> <p>Change: Allow houses to be erected according to demand and not limit it to two units for the life of the Plan. Extend the boundary when required to ensure that local people are able to erect dwellings on their own land.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - in order to distribute the growth level of the Plan, a growth estimate must be given for the Clusters tier, which is 2 units in each Cluster.</p> <p>The Plan's annual monitoring system will enable us to review what is happening within this tier. There might be a greater need within some clusters than others, and dependent upon appropriate evidence to justify this need, a higher level of growth beyond 2 units might be supported in some Clusters.</p> <p>However, if the annual monitoring work shows that the level is considerably higher within the overall Clusters tier, this could lead to a review of the Plan's Housing Distribution.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1291	Penmynydd a Star Community Council (Mr Rhys	POLICY TAI18	Object	Penmynydd has a strong community hub and we would wish to see opportunities for future generations to stay within the	<b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
	Davies) [3295]			village. The village should be identified as a cluster in the LDP under policy TAI18 and table 21 of para 7.4.128.	<p>within the Plan area.</p> <p>To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive group of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.</p> <p>The objector has not submitted a map to identify a cohesive group within the area. The Council is not of the view that there is a cohesive group of 10 or more houses in the area which the objector wishes to be included in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1399	DP Jones [2063]	POLICY TAI18	Object	Llanddaniel North East should be identified as a Cluster, comprising a cohesive group of dwellings with an urbanised appearance and of a character similar to other clusters identified in TAI18. It is not located in the AONB, its inclusion affords an opportunity as part of an overall strategy to reduce	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive group of 10 or more houses, with an</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				pressure on a nationally significant landscape. Llanddaniel North East has also been identified as a cluster in the appeal decision enclosed with the submission. It is also in an exceptionally sustainable location due to its proximity to sustainable and other transport modes, primary school and the settlements & facilities listed.	<p>operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.</p> <p>While we accept that Policy TAI 18 identifies a mix of various types of clusters, they all either have 10 or more houses on one side of a road, or form a cohesive group with houses opposite each other. In this case there are 8 houses on one side of the road, then a small gap before three houses on the other side, and none of the houses are directly opposite each other. Therefore it is not considered that there is a cohesive group in this area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1459	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI18	Object	* The following settlements do not have public sewerage facilities therefore the provisions of Circular 10/99 'Planning Requirement in respect of the Use of Non-Mains Sewerage incorporating Septic Tanks in New Development' apply and consultation with Natural Resources Wales	<b>Note comments</b> - The Councils will continue to consult DCWW at the planning application stage. Regard should also be given towards Policy PS2 and Policy ISA1 which provides the framework to ensure that the appropriate infrastructure is in place prior to development.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				will be required: Anglesey: Brynteg, Capel Coch, Capel Mawr, Capel Park, Carmel, Cerrigman, Hebron, Llanfairynghornwy, Llanynghenedl, Marianglas, Pentre Canol, Penygraigwen, Red Wharf Bay, Trefor, Tyn Lon. Gwynedd: Aberpwll, Penrhos (Caeathro), Ceidio, Dinas (Llyn), Friog, Llanaber, Llangwnadl, Treborth, Waun (Penisarwaun)	<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1461	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI18	Support	There are no known water supply issues to impact upon the delivery of 2 dwellings per cluster, however a full assessment will be made at the time of a planning application once the location of development is known.	
1462	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI18	Support	* The adequacy of the sewerage network will be assessed at the planning application stage once the location of development is known.	
1668	Mr Hayden Sandom [2931]	POLICY TAI18	Object	The group of houses subject to this representation (Cae Ficer) is a cohesive, tight and easily defined and contains sufficient dwellings to be considered a cluster. It is therefore suitable for inclusion within the plan as a cluster.	<b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.  To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive group of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.  The Council is not of the view that there is a

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>cohesive group of 10 or more houses in the area which the objector wishes to be included in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1803	Peter Day [2103]	POLICY TAI18	Object	<p>My proposal for a new cluster to be known as the 'Moranedd' be included since it has thirteen existing properties which complies with all criteria / requirements for acceptance. This has not been included and I ask that it be included. A scale plan is attached with the thirteen properties forming the proposed 'Moranedd Cluster' shown in red. Location is within 600m of a signed and recognised bus stop and from the bus stop there are services enabling arrival at major employment centres by 9a.m. 'Public Centres' within one kilometre include: Marianglas Village Hall, Parciau Public House and Goronwy Owen Hall.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive rent group of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.</p> <p>The Council is not of the view that there is a cohesive group of 10 or more houses in the area which the objector wishes to be included in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
964	Cyngor Cymuned Botwnnog (Mrs Gwenda Roberts) [1541]	TAI 18 (Map 172 Bryncroes)	Object	<p>The Plan refers to only 2 houses being permitted in the village of Bryncroes - this number is very limited considering the number of years the proposed Plan will be in force. Again this limits the rights of the individual.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - in order to distribute the growth level of the Plan, a growth estimate must be given for the Clusters tier, which is 2 units in each Cluster.</p> <p>The Plan's annual monitoring system will enable us to review what is happening within this tier. There might be a greater need within some clusters than others, and dependent upon appropriate evidence to justify this need, a higher level of growth beyond 2 units might be supported in some Clusters.</p> <p>However, if the annual monitoring work shows that the level is considerably higher within the overall Clusters tier, this could lead to a review of the Plan's Housing Distribution.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<b>No Change</b>
471	Mr E Jones [2957]	7.4.125	Object	<p>The village of Llanddeiniolen has not been designated as a cluster settlement within this policy. This must be an oversight as the village displays many of the same characteristics of size, scale and services of nearby Pentir, for example. It is important for small villages such as Llanddeiniolen that new development is forthcoming to support the village and enhance services. Overly restrictive policies of constraint will not enhance the life of the village. Small scale additions to the village can be appropriate and site SP90 on the Candidate Site register is just such a site</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive group of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.</p> <p>The Council is not of the view that there is a cohesive group of 10 or more houses in the area which the objector wishes to be included in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<b>No Change</b>
425	Mr G Dale [2954]	7.4.128	Object	<p>The village of Paradwys is not included in the list of cluster villages. This is an oversight as the village displays many of the same characteristics of other local village clusters such as nearby Star. It is important for the overall health of the village and the support and extension of village services that new development is forthcoming and suitable land is made available for this. The site referenced SP184 in the Candidate Register is such a site. To include the village of Paradwys as a defined cluster village. To identify site ref SP184 as part of the village cluster.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive group of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.</p> <p>The Council is not of the view that there is a cohesive group of 10 or more houses in the area which the objector wishes to be included in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>



#### 7.4.130 New housing in the countryside

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers Comments and Recommendations
481	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	7.4.130	Object	<p>The paragraph does not take consideration of circumstances when it may be appropriate to create or re-establish a dwelling in the countryside if it would lead to the restoration of a heritage asset or a local vernacular building which would help to preserve the Welsh culture. In those circumstances the Plan should recognise that it may not be feasible or viable for the building to be occupied by a rural worker or function as an affordable dwelling.</p> <p>The paragraph should be amended to read "Development in the open countryside will have to satisfy National Policy and TAN6 in relation to new rural enterprise dwelling or one planet development. In some cases, it may be acceptable to create a new dwelling or re-establish a previous dwelling in the open countryside if it involves the sensitive repair or refurbishment of a heritage asset that helps preserve local character or the Welsh culture. In line with Policy TAI9 in the future should there be no eligible occupier for a rural enterprise dwelling then it would be considered for occupation by those eligible for affordable dwelling, if it is viable to do so".</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – National policy and guidance emphasises the importance of protecting the countryside and only allowing developments in exceptional circumstances when it can be justified.</p> <p>Policy TAI 19 in the Plan supports the conversion of buildings in the open countryside, however, the structure must be structurally sound.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

TAI 19 – Conversion of Traditional Buildings in Open Countryside

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
358	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	POLICY TAI19	Object	<p>Suggest that for part 2 of this policy, a viability test is introduced for the affordable criteria. The term 'sub-ordinate' should be deleted as this test is too onerous. Further, the structural test should not apply where repairing or refurbishing the structure would preserve a heritage asset.</p> <p>Part 2 - amend to read "Subject to being viable, the development provides an affordable unit for the community's local need for an affordable dwelling or the residential use is an element associated with a wider scheme for business re-use;"</p> <p>Part 3 - amend to read "The building is structurally sound or involves the repair or refurbishment of a heritage asset that helps to preserve local character and/or the Welsh culture"</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Planning Policy Wales (PPW) promotes sustainable developments. Paragraph 4.7.7 of PPW promotes the majority of new development in rural areas to be located in those settlements which have relatively good accessibility by non-car modes.</p> <p>Support is given in paragraph 7.3.2 of PPW to creating some work in rural locations by the re-use of existing buildings and support for farm diversification in paragraph 7.3.3.</p> <p>Part 3.2 of Technical Advice Note 23 (2014) refers to the need to ensure that the building is appropriate to be converted. Also in areas where the creation of local employment is a priority, local planning authorities may include policies within the development plan which prohibit residential re-use in areas where creating employment is a priority, unless there is evidence of the efforts taken to ensure suitable business re-use; or that the residential conversion is a subordinate part of a scheme for business re-use; or that the resulting housing will contribute to an identified need for affordable housing for local need.</p>
605	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	POLICY TAI19	Object	<p>Restricting conversion of traditional buildings for residential use to provide local need affordable units is unviable and undeliverable given the increase in building/development costs for</p>	<p>Settlements were categorised on the basis of different facilities that were within them (please refer to Topic</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>conversion schemes. This policy will fail on viability ground as it is inevitable that the affordable housing requirement cannot be delivered in conversion schemes.</p> <p>We seek the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The requirement of affordable housing within conversion schemes should be removed.</li> <li>2. The policy should allow for minor extensions to the building to enable the development.</li> <li>3. The requirement to provide evidence that employment use of the building is not viable should be removed.</li> </ol>	<p>Paper 5 for information regarding this). To reflect the dispersed rural nature of the area, a number of settlements were identified as Clusters. However, development within such settlements, due to the lack of facilities within them, has been restricted to affordable housing only.</p> <p>In light of this, it is believed that it's appropriate to limit the use of a converted building in the countryside to employment use before considering its appropriateness as an affordable house. The priority to employment use corresponds with policy CYF 5 in the Plan.</p> <p>If it's not viable to develop a building as an affordable house, then it's believed that enough alternative opportunities exist within the settlement hierarchy, which recognises over 200 settlements in the Plan area.</p> <p>For listed buildings, policy AT2 in the Plan refers to enabling development that could be supported.</p>
1422	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	POLICY TAI19	Object	<p>The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan.</p> <p>Opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <p>* A mixture of housing including the right to develop old ruins not only for visitors but for the indigenous</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of comment / Change(s) to the Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				population to live in as well.	
1833	Carter Jonas (Mr Chris Bell) [3072]	POLICY TAI19	Object	<p>Policy TAI 19 places unreasonable restrictions on the conversion of traditional buildings in the open countryside. The reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Conversion costs are higher for traditional buildings which can impact on viability for affordable housing.</li> <li>(ii) consideration should be given towards listing status of the building.</li> <li>(iii) Each settlement should be treated differently on the basis of concern regarding second homes / holiday homes.</li> <li>(iv) No criteria for cases where compliant occupant cannot be found.</li> <li>(v) Should restrict use to principal residence only as per Exmoor National Park.</li> </ul> <p>Need a revised policy with more flexibility to treat each proposal and settlement on a case by case basis.</p>	



## CHAPTER 7.5 NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT

### Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

#### Context and Introduction

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
319	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	7.5.1	Object	The Plan rightly highlights the importance of the natural environment both for its own intrinsic value but also through the sustainable use of natural resources. This opening section sets a very negative view of the natural environment. We suggest re-wording to reflect the positive approach taken elsewhere in the Plan. Delete the first bullet point and move the (current) fifth point to the beginning	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – Rather than delete the first bullet point it is considered that this should be re-worded. It is agreed that the fifth bullet point should be moved to 2nd place with slight modifications to its wording.</p> <p><b>Recommendation -</b></p> <p>Re-word first bullet point and move the 5<sup>th</sup> bullet point to 2<sup>nd</sup> place in the list in paragraph 7.5.1.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 80</b></p>
320	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	7.5.2	Object	For greater clarity and precision his paragraph should include reference to the habitats also listed in Section 42 of the NERC Act. Add “habitats and . . .” to opening sentence of 7.5.2	<p><b>Accepted</b> – It is agreed that ‘habitats’ need to be mentioned here, as well as species.</p> <p><b>Recommendation -</b></p> <p>Include reference to habitats in the opening sentence of paragraph 7.5.2</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 81</b></p>
324	North Wales	7.5.3	Support	We welcome the recognition given to the	<b>Noted.</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
	Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]			importance of green/blue infrastructure networks and suggest that reference is also made to the concept of buffer zones to further protect these features.	<p>It is considered that PS16 is sufficiently adequate to provide protection without the need to introduce further 'buffer zones'. The impact of development will vary from site to site and will depend on the habitat/species being protected. Rather than imposing a 'buffer zone' it is that such requirements are dealt with on a case by case basis via the planning application process</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
53	Oaktree Environmental Ltd (John Williams) [2594]	7.5.4	Object	The proposed designation of the area containing and surrounding Moel Tryfan quarry as a SLA represents a needless, additional layer of designation designed to preserve the landscape where sufficient provision in this regard already exists. Albeit that it combines two existing Landscape Conservation Areas to form proposed SLA area 07, it covers land already afforded sufficient protection by the RHL designation. The addition of another layer of landscape regulation may prove an obstacle to future development at the quarry, thereby potentially undermining the effectiveness of policies relating to economic development, support of the Welsh language and mineral extraction.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Moel Tryfan is a very distinctive landscape. Part of it is designated a geological SSSI and the site includes archaeological and cultural features. SLA's were designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published in 2012 by LUC.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				Look to reduce the area covered by SLA 07 to avoid overlap with designated RHL areas.	

### PS16 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
165	Rod Dixon [2774]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	This is listed as PS19 under 7.5 in the contents table.  Change to PS16 in contents table.	<b>Not accepted</b> – It is not clear to which typographical error the objector is referring to since there does not seem to be an error in either the paper copy or the online version of the Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
232	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	This policy lacks clarity as to where it applies e.g. (not all landscapes and biodiversity assets are of the same value). The policy should relate to the local level rather than repeat national policy. If it is considered to apply to mineral extraction sites suggest changes as set out below.	<b>Not accepted</b> – The purpose of PS16 is to outline's the Plan's strategic position respect natural environment and to provide the context for the more detailed policies AMG1-AMG5. Whilst bullet point 2 and 3 of the policy make reference to 'National Policy' it is not considered that this can be construed as repeating PPW. Mineral extraction has the potential of having significant impact on natural environment and should be treated no



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				Suggest a hierarchy for assessing environmental effects of development proposals notwithstanding other policies in the development plan. There should be a positive emphasis toward existing mineral extraction sites, or extensions to those sites over new sites. Temporary environmental effects should be viewed differently to long term environmental effects.	<p>different to other forms of development. It is considered that the present wording adequately covers all the local level issues. Furthermore, minerals matters are covered in specific detail elsewhere.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
233	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	<p>This policy lacks clarity as to where it applies e.g. (not all landscapes and biodiversity assets are of the same value). The policy should relate to the local level rather than repeat national policy. If it is considered to apply to mineral extraction sites suggest changes as set out below.</p> <p>Suggest a hierarchy for assessing environmental effects of development proposals notwithstanding other policies in the development plan. There should be a positive emphasis toward existing mineral extraction sites, or extensions to those sites over new sites. Temporary environmental effects should be viewed differently to long term environmental effects.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The purpose of PS16 is to outline's the Plan's strategic position respect natural environment and to provide the context for the more detailed policies AMG1-AMG5. Whilst bullet point 2 and 3 of the policy make reference to 'National Policy' it is not considered that this can be construed as repeating PPW. Mineral extraction has the potential of having significant impact on natural environment and should be treated no different to other forms of development. It is considered that the present wording adequately covers all the local level issues. Furthermore, minerals matters are covered in specific detail elsewhere.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
311	Cyfeillion Llyn (Mrs Sian Parri) [2871]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	A specific reference to protecting the AONB should be included in line with the AONB Management Plan in line with the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000	<b>Not accepted</b> – Criterion 2 of the policy covers proposed development within AONBs. Additionally, paragraph 2.2.4 of PPW states that “National planning policy set out in Planning Policy Wales should not be repeated as policy in LDPs but plans should explain how it will apply to the local area, critically how national and local policy will work together. Furthermore, paragraph 2.2.5 of PPW notes that “Plans should not duplicate provisions in other legislative regimes.” The existing legislation and national policy and guidance in respect of AONB’s is outlined in Table 23 of the LDP  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
325	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	NB These comments are intended for PS16 but there seems to be an error on the contents link of the online document which links this policy to PS19  We welcome policy PS16 and stress that the distinctive natural environment of Gwynedd and Anglesey includes rare,	<b>Not accepted</b> – It is considered that PS16 is sufficiently adequate to provide protection without the need to introduce further ‘buffer zones’. The impact of development will vary from site to site and will depend on the habitat/species being protected. Rather than imposing a ‘buffer zone’ it is that such requirements are dealt with on a case by case basis via the planning application process

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				<p>common and a suite of typical habitats and species.</p> <p>We suggest that this policy and associated text also includes reference to buffer zones to further protect green and blue infrastructure (point 5)</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
343	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Support	<p>We welcome this policy and stress that the distinctive natural environment of Gwynedd and Anglesey includes rare, common and a suite of typical habitats and species. We suggest that this policy and associated text also includes reference to buffer zones to further protect green and blue infrastructure (point 5)</p> <p>NB There seems to be an error on the contents link of the online document which links this policy to PS19</p>	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p>It is considered that PS16 is sufficiently adequate to provide protection without the need to introduce further 'buffer zones'. The impact of development will vary from site to site and will depend on the habitat/species being protected. Rather than imposing a 'buffer zone' it is that such requirements are dealt with on a case by case basis via the planning application process</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
459	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Support	<p>Bourne Leisure endorses PS16 in principle as it seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p>	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
493	Mr Glyn Jones [2971]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	<p>Stronger policy for AONB as regards requirement for appropriate level of Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment for proposed development and</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Paragraph 2.2.4 of PPW states that "National planning policy set out in Planning Policy Wales should not be repeated as policy in LDPs but plans should explain how it will apply to the local area, critically how</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				requirement to contact relevant landscape / planning officer for the authority to provide guidance on level of LVIA that is required.	<p>national and local policy will work together. Furthermore, paragraph 2.2.5 of PPW notes that "Plans should not duplicate provisions in other legislative regimes." The existing legislation and national policy and guidance in respect of AONB's is outlined in Table 23 of the LDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
802	Ty Mawr West ltd (John Hill) [3062]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	My client wishes to repeat his strongly held views that to designate the Nantlle Valley as a Special Landscape Area would be detrimental to the local economy which factor should be borne in mind in the detailed consideration of the possible adverse effects of such designation.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Nantlle Valley is a dramatic valley with important cultural heritage (slate quarries) and borders the Snowdonia National Park. SLA's have been designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. No evidence has been presented to contradict the reasoning behind the designation of this SLA.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
805	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	AONB Management Plan - this is a statutory plan and it is believed that	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Paragraph 2.2.4 of PPW states that "National planning policy set out in Planning Policy Wales should</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
	AHNE (Cynghorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]			reference should be made to it in the relevant policies.	<p>not be repeated as policy in LDPs but plans should explain how it will apply to the local area, critically how national and local policy will work together. Furthermore, paragraph 2.2.5 of PPW notes that "Plans should not duplicate provisions in other legislative regimes." The existing legislation and national policy and guidance in respect of AONB's is outlined in Table 23 of the LDP.</p> <p>Nonetheless, it is considered that the Plan would benefit from amendments that draw attention to the need to consider the relevant AONB Management Plans at a planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.5.13 to refer to the AONB Management Plans. Also include an additional Policy to require consideration of the Management Plans at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 82 &amp; NF 85</b></p>
806	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cynghorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	AONB - there is no specific policy in terms of maintaining and safeguarding the AONB. Rather, there are general policies and a reference to national legislation and policy. It is believed that a specific policy is required to maintain and retain the AONB, similar to Policy B8 in the current plan.	<b>Not accepted</b> – Criterion 2 of the Policy covers proposed development within the AONBs. Additionally, paragraph 2.2.4 of PPW states that "National planning policy set out in Planning Policy Wales should not be repeated as policy in LDPs but plans should explain how it will apply to the local area, critically how national and local policy will work together. Furthermore, paragraph 2.2.5 of PPW notes that "Plans should not duplicate provisions in other legislative regimes." The existing legislation and national

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					<p>policy and guidance in respect of AONB's is outlined in Table 23 of the LDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
812	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Support	Bangor Civic Society wish to support PS16	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
891	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	<p>Conserving and enhancing the natural environment is a policy that we strongly support. We are not comfortable that the sites of local importance to Borth-y-Gest, namely the local nature reserves of Parc y Borth and Pen y Banc, and their adjacent ecological continuums are identified appropriately, in accordance with AMG4 local biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>Table 23 is an important schedule of nature conservation designations but it makes no reference to local or non-statutory nature reserves and believe</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Table 23 provides details on the schedule of statutory nature conservation designations and it is important that this table is read in the context of the preceding paragraphs . In accordance with paragraph 5.3.11 of PPW and paragraph 5.5.1 of TAN 5 - Nature Conservation and Planning (2009), local nature reserves (LNRs) are regarded as 'non statutory designations/local sites'. Consequently it would not be appropriate to make reference to LNRs under Table 23. Furthermore, it is considered that adequate protection is afforded to LNRs under policy AMG5 of the LDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				that this omission should be rectified. More over the constraints map is too indistinct to identify features definitively, but it is uncertain that Parc y Borth is clearly identified as a LNR and Pen y Banc is not and would like the omission corrected.	amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
898	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Support	<p>Bourne Leisure endorses PS16 in principle as it seeks to conserve and enhance the natural environment. The exceptional natural environment of Gwynedd, comprises the key visitor attraction of the area and therefore the desire to protect and where possible enhance the natural environment is supported by Bourne Leisure. Indeed the Destination Management Plan 2013-2020 states that 54% of visitors visited Gwynedd because of the scenery/landscape.</p> <p>Greenacres and Hafan y Môr holiday parks are both located in environmentally sensitive locations. Bourne Leisure comments that this should not rule out development at these sites providing that the development is appropriate to the location and that commensurate mitigation measures can be implemented to mitigate both direct and indirect impacts.</p>	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				Bourne Leisure would like to stress that not all development has the potential to negatively impact on key landscape, public views and open spaces.	
900	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	The AONBs are given an inappropriately low emphasis in the JLDP draft in comparison with the GUDP. There should be a much more explicit and positive local commitment to the statutory duties to protect nationally designated landscapes and their settings, in line with SP2, B8 and B14 in the GUDP. Explicit reference should be made to the AONB Management Plans.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Criterion 2 of the Policy covers proposed development within the AONBs. Additionally, paragraph 2.2.4 of PPW states that “National planning policy set out in Planning Policy Wales should not be repeated as policy in LDPs but plans should explain how it will apply to the local area, critically how national and local policy will work together. Furthermore, paragraph 2.2.5 of PPW notes that “Plans should not duplicate provisions in other legislative regimes.” The existing legislation and national policy and guidance in respect of AONB’s is outlined in Table 23 of the LDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1092	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	With regards to Policy PS16 and AMG4 NRW questions the need for both these policies and if they should be incorporated into a single 'Biodiversity' Policy. A single policy, similar to Policy NTE/3 in the Conwy LDP, would provide	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - PS16 refers to the natural environment and covers a different scale, being more overarching – as indicated by the title ‘Strategic Policy’, whereas AMG4 provides more information relating to the application of this policy in practical terms to the planning case level for biodiversity, which is narrower than the ‘natural</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				the policy structure for safeguarding species of European, National and local importance as well as referring to the need to achieve the targets of the LBAP. The policy should include a hierarchy that clearly defines the level of protection afforded to sites and species and include reference to species included within Section 42 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1991 which the Authority has a duty to protect under the NERC Act (2006).	environment'. Therefore it is considered that the two separate policies are justified.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1182	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	There is a typographical error in the introduction: It should be "effect", not "affect".  Horizon submits that greater flexibility needs to be included in these policies so that proposals predicted to have an adverse effect will be permissible subject to the identification and implementation of sufficient mitigation measures, supported by an appropriate implementation plan. Rather than seek specific amendments to these policies Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed above which would be the relevant policies against which to make consultation responses to the DCO	<b>Accepted in part</b> – It is accepted that there is a typographical error in the introduction of the English version and that this should be amended accordingly.  It is considered that there is sufficient flexibility within the existing policies to accommodate appropriate forms of development. Like any other form of development any planning application/DCO in respect of Wylfa Newydd will be required to take account of all the relevant policies contained within the LDP.  <b>Recommendation</b>  Correct typographical error in the English version of the JLDP  <b>Minor Change: NB 17</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				application and to determine its associated development applications.	
1423	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	NFU Wales would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. The Plan should promote a high quality landscape acknowledging that agriculture has to play in it.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Whilst the contribution that agriculture has played in creating the Plan's 'high quality landscape' is acknowledged, it would not be appropriate to make reference to the role of agriculture as suggested by the objector in the context of policy PS16.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1439	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	The possible impact of development on the favourable conservation status of protected species needs further consideration. Species present in Gwynedd and Ynys Mon include otters, bats and water voles. Relevant policies should ensure that proposed development assessed under the provisions of the Plan and on allocations give proper and full consideration to protected species in order to comply with relevant legislative requirements.	<p><b>Comment noted</b> - Paragraph 2.2.4 of PPW states that "National planning policy set out in Planning Policy Wales should not be repeated as policy in LDPs but plans should explain how it will apply to the local area, critically how national and local policy will work together. Furthermore, paragraph 2.2.5 of PPW notes that "Plans should not duplicate provisions in other legislative regimes." Chapter 5 of PPW along with TAN 5 provides planning guidance in respect of international and national designations which are protected by legislation.</p> <p>In respect of PS16 bullet point 6 already makes reference to "Safeguarding internationally, nationally and locally protected species". Furthermore policies AMG4 and AMG 5 of the LDP provides the local planning context in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					<p>respect of regional/local species.</p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with NRW at a planning application stage. When considering any development proposal (including on land allocated for development in the plan) the local planning authorities will consider environmental impact, so as to avoid, wherever possible, adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change required to address matters raised in the representation</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1443	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	<p>A number of the allocated sites are located within, adjacent or in close proximity to the Llŷn and Ynys Môn AONBs. We remind you of the Authority's duty under Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000, which requires public bodies to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of an AONB. It is considered that where an allocation has the potential to significantly affect the AONB and its associated boundary area, the site would need to be rigorously assessed in terms of adverse impact on</p>	<p><b>Comment noted</b> – Paragraph 2.2.4 of PPW states that “National planning policy set out in Planning Policy Wales should not be repeated as policy in LDPs but plans should explain how it will apply to the local area, critically how national and local policy will work together. Furthermore, paragraph 2.2.5 of PPW notes that “Plans should not duplicate provisions in other legislative regimes.” The existing legislation and national policy and guidance in respect of AONB’s is outlined in Table 23 of the LDP.</p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with NRW at a planning application stage. When considering any development proposal (including on land allocated for development in the plan) the local planning authorities</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				the amenity and special qualities of the AONB.	<p>will consider environmental impact, so as to avoid, wherever possible, adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change required to address matters raised in the representation</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1444	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	Some allocations are located within or adjacent to landscapes that are registered by CADW as Landscapes of Historic Interest. While this isn't a statutory designation, Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales identifies that it should be a material planning consideration in the planning process and must be given due regard.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Registered Historic Landscapes are covered by policy PS17</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
429	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS16	Object	The Plan should include the fact that no planning application should be approved which significantly harms historic woodland, in line with Wales Planning Policy. It should be noted that every opportunity to plant trees in suitable areas should be taken, in order to improve the local environment.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Paragraph 5.2.9 of PPW contains statements of national development management policy in respect of trees and woodlands, including ancient and semi natural woodlands and therefore it is not required to be repeated as local policy in LDPs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

#### AMG1 – Special Landscape Areas

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
54	Oaktree Environmental Ltd (John Williams) [2594]	POLICY AMG1	Object	<p>The SLAs identified on the Proposals Map overlap other landscape designations which appear to have the same purpose of landscape protection. Where such overlap occurs, consideration should be given to reducing the extent of the SLA in order to avoid duplication of designated areas. In terms of our client's site, which is contained within proposed SLA 07, the landscape is characteristic of the mineral extraction industry in the area and should not be an excessive burden on the future extraction of mineral in the area</p> <p>Look to reduce the area covered by SLA 07 to avoid overlap with designated RHL areas.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have been designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. No evidence has been presented to contradict the reasoning behind the designation of this SLA and justify the reduction in area covered by it. The mineral extraction industry has the potential to have a significant impact on the landscape and should not be treated any different to other forms of development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
234	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY AMG1	Object	<p>There should be a positive emphasis toward existing mineral extraction sites, or extensions to those sites over new sites. Temporary environmental effects</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The mineral extraction industry has the potential to have a significant impact on the landscape and should not be treated any different to other forms of development. This policy does not specifically</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				<p>should be viewed differently to long term environmental effects.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to include the words "long-term" effects thus allowing for mineral extraction in the interim and refer to restoration proposals being "in accordance" with the "long-term" objectives of the protection of special landscape areas.</p>	<p>prohibit/restrict mineral extraction within SLA's but ensures that there is adequate information available for the LPA to make informed decisions on planning applications.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
235	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY AMG1	Object	<p>There should be a positive emphasis toward existing mineral extraction sites, or extensions to those sites over new sites. Temporary environmental effects should be viewed differently to long term environmental effects.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to include the words "long-term" effects thus allowing for mineral extraction in the interim and refer to restoration proposals being "in accordance" with the "long-term" objectives of the protection of special landscape areas.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The mineral extraction industry has the potential to have a significant impact on the landscape and should not be treated any different to other forms of development. This policy does not specifically prohibit/restrict mineral extraction within SLA's but ensures that there is adequate information available for the LPA to make informed decisions on planning applications.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
291	Mr Myrddin Roberts [2858]	POLICY AMG1	Object	The officers who are drawing up the new Joint Local Development Plan have not	<b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				<p>adequately involved local stakeholders such as community councils, farmers, landowners and residents before designating Special Landscape Areas on the map of Anglesey especially for the SLA named Beaumaris Wooded Slopes and Llangoed Vale. I happen to be the current chairman of Llanddona Community Council, so I know that no officer has attended any of our meetings. We as residents, should have been alerted to this proposed major change in policy. Meaningful dialogue, outlining the implications on businesses, land and homes has not happened.</p> <p>That Policy AMG1 be deleted until such time that all stakeholders have been informed of the proposed introduction of SLA's and discussion and agreement reached by all relevant parties, especially the local community and officers of the Joint Development Plan.</p>	<p>Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. On Anglesey the former Special Landscape Area almost covered the whole of Unitary Authority area. The new SLA's replace the former designation and now only relate to specific parts of the Unitary Authority area. Consequently, SLA's should not be regarded as a new designation and will have no greater implications for local businesses and residents than those which exist at present. The formal designation of the SLA's will be undertaken via the LDP consultation process.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
365	Dr Morag McGrath [231]	POLICY AMG1	Object	<p>It is difficult to see how any development can 'add' to the historical, visual, geographical, ecological and cultural features of an SLA.</p> <p>Change the wording to 'maintain, enhance or restore the recognised</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – It is considered that this would improve the clarity of the policy and provide consistency with paragraph 7.5.10.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Change the wording of the policy to 'maintain, enhance</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				character and qualities' as in 7.5.10.	or restore the recognised character and qualities'  <b>Focussed Change - NF 83</b>
375	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	POLICY AMG1	Support	The Company supports the Policy as worded. See the Company's separate representation in respect of the area to which it applies.	<b>Noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
460	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY AMG1	Object	Bourne Leisure considers that AMG1 should explicitly set out that due to the need for tourism facilities to be located near the coast there is a high probability that they will also be located in a SLA. Tourist facilities are in a constant state of change, with redevelopment and site rationalisation taking place at all times, to meet the needs of the dynamic tourism market. Bourne Leisure considers that even for sites located in the SLA, appropriate development can come forward providing that commensurate mitigation measures can be implemented to mitigate both direct and indirect impacts.	<b>Not accepted</b> – the tourism industry should not be treated differently to any other form of development. This policy does not inhibit the appropriate development within SLA's but outlines how such proposals will be considered within the local planning context.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
609	Mr Paul Madden [3032]	POLICY AMG1	Object	The whole of Anglesey was identified under policy 31 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan as a Special Landscape area (SLA). In the emerging Plan only a few areas are identified as an SLA and the criteria now used could apply to the whole island	<b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have been designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC.  The rationale behind designating Global Geoparks is significantly different to that for SLAs. Geopark status is



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				being a SLA. Anglesey could be awarded an enhanced global geopark status which is of equivalent status to a world heritage site. It does not offer sufficient protection against unsuitable development and reverses longstanding policy without adequate justification. Anglesey as a whole should be designated as a SLA.	<p>concerned about acknowledging the high quality of local geological heritage, where greater appreciation and understanding of that geological heritage can benefit local people and businesses through tourism and education initiatives. Geopark status has no legislative basis or land use planning implications.</p> <p>Furthermore, Geoparks are already protected through other LDP policies for example PS17 (second bullet point) and policy AMG5.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
808	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cyngorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY AMG1	Object	In some places, this area (Western Llŷn SLA) abuts the AONB and protects the setting of the AONB. However, some parts of the AONB are not protected in this way. Therefore, it is believed that reference should be made to safeguarding the setting of the AONB in the relevant policies.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Reference to issue is made in the last sentence in policy AMG2 which states that “Additional consideration will also be given to developments which directly affect the landscape character and setting of the AONBs or the National Park”.</p> <p>However, it is noted that there is an error in the Welsh version and that ‘yn uniongyrchol’ should be included after “effeithio” in the last sentence of policy AMG2 in order to be consistent with the English version</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That the words 'yn uniongyrchol' should be included after "effeithio" in the last sentence of policy AMG2.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB 18</b></p>
811	Cyngor Cymuned Botwnnog (Mrs Gwenda Roberts) [1541]	POLICY AMG1	Object	The New Coastal Landscape Conservation Area Scheme once more limits the rights of the residents of Pen Llŷn by preventing them building houses in their own area. The countryside will die as a result and depopulation can be expected - if it comes to that the unique culture and traditions of the countryside will be lost forever. Won't the Council regret losing such a valuable resource?	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – this is considered a general comment and has no specific relevance to policy AMG1. SLA's will have no direct impact on the location housing within the Plan area which will be guided by the relevant housing policies contained within the LDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
880	Mr John Tripp [252]	POLICY AMG1	Support	Delighted to see 5 new conservation areas in Anglesey.	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
892	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	POLICY AMG1	Object	This policy seeks to ensure that development within SLAs has "no detrimental impact on the landscape" This test and requirement is overly onerous and disproportionate to the SLA	<p><b>Accept in part</b> – it is accepted that the phrase 'no detrimental impact' is overly onerous. However, rather than the change suggested by the objector the wording should be amended to 'no significant adverse impact' in order to provide consistency of wording with the rest of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				<p>status. Also practically impossible in delivering any development not to have an impact of some form on the landscape.</p> <p>Significantly the policy as drafted requires "no detrimental impact on the landscape" and does not embody the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as required by PPW. Reference should be made to the presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Reference to "no detrimental impact" should be deleted and replaced with "no significant impact" and a further balance provided in that any impact may be outweighed by the positive effects of the development.</p>	<p>the policy.</p> <p>Policy AMG2 is not a 'catch all' policy and needs to be read in the context of the whole LDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Modify the wording of the first sentence of policy AMG to 'no significant adverse impact'</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 83</b></p>
899	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY AMG1	Object	<p>AMG1 allows development to come forward as long as its scale and nature is appropriate and that there is no detrimental impact on the landscape.</p> <p>Policy AMG1 therefore provides a positive policy basis for appropriate development come forward in the SLAs.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure would like to stress that not all development has the potential to negatively impact on key landscape,</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – the tourism industry should not be treated differently to any other form of development. This policy does not inhibit the appropriate development within SLA's but outlines how such proposals will be considered within the local planning context.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				<p>public views and open spaces.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure considers that AMG1 should explicitly set out that due to the need for tourism facilities to be located near the coast there is a high probability that they will also be located in a SLA. Tourist facilities are in a constant state of change, with redevelopment and site rationalisation taking place at all times, to meet the needs of the dynamic tourism market.</p>	<b>No Change</b>
901	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY AMG1	Object	<p>We support the new emphasis on local protection through the SLAs (AMG1). Their role as providing buffers to protect the settings of the AONB should be emphasised and reinforced by extending SLAs close to areas of AONB without that protection. The scope and intentions of AMG2 as distinct from AMG1 need clarification.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Not accepted - SLA's have been designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. It is considered that protecting the settings of the AONB is adequately covered by existing legislation and national planning guidance and need not be repeated at a local level.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
904	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr	POLICY AMG1	Object	<p>Clarify details of and reasons for proposed changes in Western Llŷn SLA compared to former Western Llŷn LCA</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have been designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. A copy</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
	Noel Davey) [1169]			near Abersoch and Pwllheli.	of this report is on both Council's website for public viewing.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
905	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY AMG1	Object	Provide for an SLA as a buffer area to protect the northern part of the Llŷn AONB, comprising (for example) a 2km belt to form the southern backdrop of Yr Eifl and the Clynog Hills.	<b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have been designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. It is considered that protecting the settings of the AONB is adequately covered by existing legislation and national planning guidance and need not be repeated at a local level.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
906	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY AMG1	Object	SLAs 8 and 9 protecting the south Menai Strait shore should be extended to include unprotected areas on the Gwynedd side of the Menai, between Foryd Bay and Felinheli, either side of the	<b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have been designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. It is considered that protecting the settings of the AONB is adequately covered by existing legislation and national

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				World Heritage site in Caernarfon. Apart from protecting a valuable and vulnerable local landscape, reinstating a former Landscape Conservation Area, their key role would be to provide a buffer for the Anglesey AONB on the north side of the Strait.	<p>planning guidance and need not be repeated at a local level.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
55	Oaktree Environmental Ltd (John Williams) [2594]	7.5.9	Object	<p>There should be no need for additional protection if areas of land are already protected by other landscape designations which recognise the quality of the landscape concerned. Our client's site is a working quarry which is located in an area recognised for its historic landscape value and so designated. There should be no need to afford the area additional landscape protection when such already exists.</p> <p>Look to reduce the area covered by SLA 07 to avoid overlap with designated RHL areas.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. No evidence has been presented to contradict the reasoning behind the designation of this SLA and justify the reduction in area covered by it. The mineral extraction industry has the potential to have a significant impact on the landscape and should not be treated any different to other forms of development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
56	Oaktree Environmental Ltd (John Williams)	7.5.10	Object	Where landscape protection already exists, development proposals should already be required to give consideration	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. No</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
	[2594]			<p>to maintaining, enhancing or restoring the recognised character and quality of the areas. Conferring SLA status to such areas is therefore an unnecessary exercise which serves little purpose given the existing level of landscape protection.</p> <p>Look to reduce the area covered by SLA 07 to avoid overlap with designated RHL areas</p>	<p>evidence has been presented to contradict the reasoning behind the designation of this SLA and justify the reduction in area covered by it. The mineral extraction industry has the potential to have a significant impact on the landscape and should not be treated any different to other forms of development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
426	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	7.5.10	Object	<p>We support this policy to safeguard Special Landscape Areas. But in our opinion, Cwmorthin should be included amongst these. This area is certainly one which is incredibly striking and beautiful, and deserves to be specifically protected.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. On Anglesey the former Special Landscape Area almost covered the whole of Unitary Authority area. The new SLA's replace the former designation and now only relate to specific parts of the Unitary Authority area. Consequently, SLA's should not be regarded as a new designation and will have no greater implications for local businesses and residents than those which exist at present. The formal designation of the SLA's will be undertaken via the LDP consultation process.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
275	Mr Myrddin Roberts [2858]	7.5.11	Object	No discussions have taken place with the relevant Community Councils and landowners in respect of the new SLA named Beaumaris Wooded Slopes and Llangoed Vale. Surely all interested parties should have been made aware of this new designation and its implications on their businesses, land and homes. This major change and addition to planning policy merits more stakeholder input. It is insufficient to state that this is the time for public comment when we have not had detailed information readily available and had the necessary discussions with members of the Joint Development Plan.	<b>Not accepted</b> - SLA's have designated following a detailed review of existing SLA's in Gwynedd and Anglesey. This report was published 2012 by LUC. On Anglesey the former Special Landscape Area almost covered the whole of Unitary Authority area. The new SLA's replace the former designation and now only relate to specific parts of the Unitary Authority area. Consequently, SLA's should not be regarded as a new designation and will have no greater implications for local businesses and residents than those which exist at present. The formal designation of the SLA's will be undertaken via the LDP consultation process.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

#### AMG2 – Protecting and Enhancing Features and Qualities that are Unique to the Local Landscape Character

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
236	Ellesmere Sand &	POLICY AMG2	Object	There should be a positive emphasis	<b>Not accepted</b> - The mineral extraction industry has the



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
	Gravel Company Limited [2686]			<p>toward existing mineral extraction sites, or extensions to those sites over new sites. Temporary environmental effects should be viewed differently to long term environmental effects. Suggest duplication with Policy AMG1.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to include the words "long-term" effects thus allowing for mineral extraction in the interim and refer to restoration proposals being "in accordance" with the "long-term" objectives of the protection of special landscape areas. Suggest potential merge with Policy AMG1.</p>	<p>potential to have a significant impact on the landscape and should not be treated any different to other forms of development. This policy does not specifically prohibit/restrict mineral extraction within SLA's but ensures that there is adequate information available for the LPA to make informed decisions on planning applications.</p> <p>Policy AMG2 refer to Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) and not to SLAs. LCAs cover the whole area of Anglesey and Gwynedd and are defined in the Landscape Strategy for each authority. Consequently the policy relates to the wider landscape than just those included within SLAs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
237	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY AMG2	Object	<p>There should be a positive emphasis toward existing mineral extraction sites, or extensions to those sites over new sites. Temporary environmental effects should be viewed differently to long term environmental effects. Suggest duplication with Policy AMG1.</p> <p>The policy should be amended to include</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The mineral extraction industry has the potential to have a significant impact on the landscape and should not be treated any different to other forms of development. This policy does not specifically prohibit/restrict mineral extraction but ensures that there is adequate information available for the LPA to make informed decisions on planning applications.</p> <p>Policy AMG2 refer to Landscape Character Areas (LCAs)</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				the words "long-term" effects thus allowing for mineral extraction in the interim and refer to restoration proposals being "in accordance" with the "long-term" objectives of the protection of special landscape areas. Suggest potential merge with Policy AMG1.	and not to SLAs. LCAs cover the whole area of Anglesey and Gwynedd and are defined in the Landscape Strategy for each authority. Consequently the policy relates to the wider landscape than just those included within SLAs.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
330	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY AMG2	Object	SLA are adequately covered by AMG1, for greater clarity AMG2 should be re-worded to protect the wider landscape and the important characteristic features of the local landscapes of Gwynedd and Anglesey. Remove reference to SLA and ensure policy relates to wider landscape.	<b>Not accepted</b> – Policy AMG2 refer to Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) and not to SLAs. LCAs cover the whole area of Anglesey and Gwynedd and are defined in the Landscape Strategy for each authority. Consequently the policy relates to the wider landscape than just those included within SLAs.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
809	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cyngorydd	POLICY AMG2	Object	It is a praiseworthy but slightly complicated policy, and it is believed that it could be difficult to put into operation.	<b>Not accepted</b> – it is considered that the policy is sufficiently clear in meaning and capable of being implemented.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
	Gruffydd Williams) [3090]				<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
886	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	POLICY AMG2	Support	<p>Policies AMG2, AMG3 and AMG4 related to features and qualities that are unique to the local landscape, coastal protection and local biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>We support these policies which are in line with the objectives of the Friends of Borth-y-Gest.</p>	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
893	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	POLICY AMG2	Object	<p>The policy does not set a qualifying requirement that impacts need to be "significant". It merely requires an adverse impact. This is not appropriate as any development may be deemed to have an adverse impact in some form on the landscape.</p> <p>Furthermore, the policy does not allow the balancing of the economic, social or indeed other environmental benefits of a project (remediation and demolition of a contaminate site and large buildings), compared to the landscape impact arising from a small scale development.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – it is accepted that 'significant' should replace 'adverse' in the first sentence and also included before 'adverse in the second sentence of policy AMG2.</p> <p>Policy AMG2 is not a 'catch all' policy and needs to be read in the context of the whole LDP including those sections referring to the economy and sustainable development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That 'significant' should replace 'adverse' in the first sentence and also included before 'adverse in the second sentence of policy AMG2.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				presumption in favour of sustainable development. The policy should be revised to require landscape impacts to be significant in undesignated areas and for these to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the economic, social or other environmental benefits before an application is refused on the basis of this policy.	<b>Focussed Change - NF 84</b>
1445	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY AMG2	Object	We would recommend that this policy name is changed to protecting and enhancing features and qualities that are 'distinctive or special' to the landscape character rather than 'unique'.	<b>Accepted –</b> It is considered that the 'distinctive' should be used as opposed to 'unique' in the title of AMG2.  <b>Recommendation</b>  That 'the 'distinctive' should be used as opposed to 'unique' in the title of AMG2.  <b>Focussed Change - NF 84</b>
1446	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY AMG2	Object	Criterion 3 should be amended to read "layout of settlements and boundary types".	<b>Not accepted –</b> It is not considered that the suggested wording would improve the clarity of the criterion. Furthermore, 'boundary types' is covered by 'traditional features'.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
57	Oaktree Environmental Ltd (John Williams) [2594]	7.5.12	Object	<p>The area containing our client's site is protected by a historic landscape designation considered sufficient to maintain the unique scenery and sense of place. It is ironic that further development at the quarry may be affected by protection of landscape characteristics that would not have existed but for the mineral extraction industry. The Nantlle Valley is renowned for its slate quarrying heritage and, in an area where good quality jobs may be scarce, extraction and processing of slate provides the basis for job creation to retain local populations in an industry that characterises the area in landscape and cultural terms.</p> <p>Look to reduce the area covered by SLA 07 to avoid overlap with designated RHL areas.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – paragraph 7.5.12 makes no reference to SLA's. This objection has no relevance to the paragraph in question. A similar observation has already been made by the objector in respect of policy AMG1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### AMG3 – Coastal Protection

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
810	Cydbwyllgor	POLICY AMG3	Object	The Heritage Coast is a local designation	<b>Not accepted</b> – it is considered that the importance of

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
	Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cyngorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]			that largely follows the AONB's coastal boundary in Llŷn. It is believed that this policy should reflect the designation in a more positive manner through further conserving the HC.	the Heritage Coast is adequately covered in policy AMG3 and paragraph 7.5.17.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
887	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	POLICY AMG3	Support	Policies AMG2, AMG3 and AMG4 related to features and qualities that are unique to the local landscape, coastal protection and local biodiversity conservation.  We support these policies which are in line with the objectives of the Friends of Borth-y-Gest.	<b>Noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### AMG4 – Local Biodiversity Conservation

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
238	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY AMG4	Object	Suggest the policy is repetitive of national policy, unwieldy and requires flexibility in the wording as no definition or hierarchy is set out in regard to mineral extraction sites.	<b>Accepted in part</b> – it is agreed that reference to international and national sites should be deleted from the policy to avoid duplication with national policy. In respect of minerals matters, these are covered in specific detail elsewhere.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				Would suggest merge with Policy AMG5 and change in wording to first sentence to read "Proposals should where appropriate protect and enhance biodiversity that has been identified as being important to the local area."	<p>Unlike AMG4, AMG5 refers exclusively to local sites which do not enjoy statutory protection in the way SSSIs and SACs do. The level of protection afforded to these local sites is defined in the LDP and it therefore is appropriate to have this as a separate policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That the policy should be re-drafted to improve its clarity, avoid duplication with national policy and to reflect the importance and status of local biodiversity sites.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 86</b></p>
239	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY AMG4	Object	<p>Suggest the policy is repetitive of national policy, unwieldy and requires flexibility in the wording as no definition or hierarchy is set out in regard to mineral extraction sites.</p> <p>Would suggest merge with Policy AMG5 and change in wording to first sentence to read "Proposals should where appropriate protect and enhance biodiversity that has been identified as being important to the local area."</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – it is agreed that reference to international and national sites should be deleted from the policy to avoid duplication with national policy. In respect of minerals matters, these are covered in specific detail elsewhere.</p> <p>Unlike AMG4, AMG5 refers exclusively to local sites which do not enjoy statutory protection in the way SSSIs and SACs do. The level of protection afforded to these local sites is defined in the LDP and it therefore is appropriate to have this as a separate policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That the policy should be re-drafted to improve its clarity, avoid duplication with national policy and to reflect the importance and status of local biodiversity sites.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					<b>Focussed Change - NF 86</b>
333	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY AMG4	Support	We welcome the protection given to local biodiversity through this policy	<b>Noted.</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
462	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY AMG4	Object	Point 1 should be amended to state that only alternative sites that are reasonably related to the application site should need to be considered to satisfy this policy. Point 2 should be amended to acknowledge that some developments already exist within areas of international, national and local biodiversity importance. Further development at these locations should be permitted as long as biodiversity is protected and enhanced.	<b>Accepted in part</b> – it is considered that the words ‘satisfactory alternative site’ in Criterion 1 is sufficiently adequate to cover the objector’s concerns regarding the need to be ‘reasonably related’ to the application site. However, the word “addas” should be included after “safle amgen arall” in the Welsh version of the amended policy in order to have consistency with the English version of the policy.  In respect of Criterion 2 the objector’s comments are accepted and the wording be amended by inserting the words “significant harmful impacts” after “avoiding” in the amended policy.  <b>Recommendation</b>  That the policy should be re-drafted to improve its clarity, avoid duplication with national policy and to reflect the importance and status of local biodiversity sites.  <b>Focussed Change - NF 86</b>
888	Friends of Borth-y	POLICY AMG4	Support	Policies AMG2, AMG3 and AMG4 related	<b>Noted</b>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
	Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]			<p>to features and qualities that are unique to the local landscape, coastal protection and local biodiversity conservation.</p> <p>We support these policies which are in line with the objectives of the Friends of Borth-y-Gest.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
897	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY AMG4	Object	<p>AMG4 does not provide a positive basis for appropriate development to come forward and could stifle appropriate development.</p> <p>Point 1 should be amended to state that only alternative sites that are reasonably related to the application site should need to be considered to satisfy this policy. Bourne Leisure considers that it is inappropriate to assess alternative sites that are not reasonably related to the existing site.</p> <p>Point 2 should be amended to acknowledge that some developments already exist within areas of international, national and local biodiversity importance. Further development at these locations should be permitted as long as biodiversity is protected and enhanced.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – it is considered that the words ‘satisfactory alternative site’ in Criterion 1 is sufficiently adequate to cover the objector’s concerns regarding the need to be ‘reasonably related’ to the application site.</p> <p>In respect of Criterion 2 the objector’s comments are accepted and the wording be amended by inserting the words “significant harmful impacts” after “avoiding” in the amended policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That the policy should be re-drafted to improve its clarity, avoid duplication with national policy and to reflect the importance and status of local biodiversity sites.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 86</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				<p>Bourne Leisure considers it important for Anglesey and Gwynedd to take a balanced, pragmatic approach with regard to development proposals that have the potential to affect biodiversity.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure notes that specific developments also have the potential to generate net gain in biodiversity value through habitat creation.</p>	
1073	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY AMG4	Object	It requires further re-drafting. As drafted the policy seems overly onerous for the consideration of development proposals on local non-statutory nature conservation designations.	<p><b>Accepted</b> – it is considered that the policy should be re-drafted. The proposed re-wording will not effect on the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That the policy should be re-drafted to improve its clarity, avoid duplication with national policy and to reflect the importance and status of local biodiversity sites.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 86</b></p>
1440	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY AMG4	Object	We have not considered possible effects on all local or regional interests. Therefore, the possibility of adverse effects on such interests should not be ruled out, which would be relevant to your Authority's general duty to have regard to conserving biodiversity as set out in section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural communities	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – whilst the comments are accepted, it is considered that the issues raised by the objector are already covered in policy AMG4. Furthermore, it is considered that the proposed re-drafted wording of AMG4 should help improve the clarity of this policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>That the policy should be re-drafted to improve its clarity,</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				(NERC) Act (2006). This advice includes any consideration of the planned provision of 'linear' and 'stepping stone' habitats as defined in Article 10 of the Habitats Directive.	avoid duplication with national policy and to reflect the importance and status of local biodiversity sites.  <b>Focussed Change - NF 86</b>
1675	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY AMG4	Object	With regards to Policy PS16 and AMG4 NRW questions the need for both these policies and if they should be incorporated into a single 'Biodiversity' Policy. A single policy, similar to Policy NTE/3 in the Conwy LDP, would provide the policy structure for safeguarding species of European, national and local importance as well as referring to the need to achieve the targets of the LBAP. The policy should include a hierarchy that clearly defines the level of protection afforded to sites and species and include reference to species included within Section 42 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1991 which the Authority has a duty to protect under the NERC Act (2006).	<b>Not accepted</b> - PS16 refers to the natural environment and covers a different scale, being more overarching – as indicated by the title 'Strategic Policy', whereas AMG4 provides more information about the application of this policy as it will apply in practical terms to the planning case level for local biodiversity, which is narrower than the 'natural environment'. Therefore it is considered that the two separate policies are justified.  Policy guidance on protecting species of international and national importance is outlined in PPW and should not be repeated in the LDP. Consequently AMG4 focuses on wildlife species and habitats of local importance.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

**AMG5 – Protecting Sites of Regional or Local Significance**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
164	Rod Dixon [2774]	POLICY AMG5	Object	<p>Anglesey is likely to achieve UNESCO global Geopark status. This should be included as a protected area.</p> <p>Include UNESCO sites and Global Geoparks as protected areas.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Geopark status is concerned about acknowledging the high quality of local geological heritage, where greater appreciation and understanding of that geological heritage can benefit local people and businesses through tourism and education initiatives. Geopark status has no legislative basis or land use planning implications.</p> <p>Whilst the same could also be argued for World Heritage Sites, PPW does provide guidance on how WHS should be protected within the national planning framework.</p> <p>Furthermore, Geoparks are already protected through other LDP policies for example PS17 (second bullet point) and policy AMG5.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
192	Mrs Irene Stott [2780]	POLICY AMG5	Object	<p>Anglesey is likely to achieve UNESCO global Geopark status. This should be included as a protected area. Include UNESCO sites and Global Geoparks as protected areas.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Geopark status is concerned about acknowledging the high quality of local geological heritage, where greater appreciation and understanding of that geological heritage can benefit local people and businesses through tourism and education initiatives.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					<p>Geopark status has no legislative basis or land use planning implications.</p> <p>Whilst the same could also be argued for World Heritage Sites, PPW does provide guidance on how WHS should be protected within the national planning framework.</p> <p>Furthermore, Geoparks are already protected through other LDP policies for example PS17 (second bullet point) and policy AMG5.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
240	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY AMG5	Object	<p>The policy should look more positively toward mineral extraction development and support existing sites and extensions to existing sites over new development.</p> <p>Suggest potential merge with Policy AMG4 to allow for Ecological Assessment to support development of sites.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Mineral extraction can have significant ecological impacts and each case should be considered individually; no ecological justification for giving this industry preferential treatment over other industries.</p> <p>Unlike AMG4, AMG5 refers exclusively to local sites which do not enjoy statutory protection in the way SSSIs and SAC do. The level of protection afforded to these sites is defined in the LDP and it therefore seems appropriate to have this as a separate policy.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
					<p>Furthermore, Geoparks are already protected through other LDP policies for example PS17 (second bullet point) and policy AMG5.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
241	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY AMG5	Object	<p>The policy should look more positively toward mineral extraction development and support existing sites and extensions to existing sites over new development.</p> <p>Suggest potential merge with Policy AMG4 to allow for Ecological Assessment to support development of sites.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Mineral extraction can have significant ecological impacts and each case should be considered individually; no ecological justification for giving this industry preferential treatment over other industries.</p> <p>Unlike AMG4, AMG5 refers exclusively to local sites which do not enjoy statutory protection in the way SSSIs and SAC do. The level of protection afforded to these sites is defined in the LDP and it therefore seems appropriate to have this as a separate policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
338	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY AMG5	Object	<p>We welcome the support given to sites of regional or local importance.</p> <p>However we suggest that the second paragraph starts with "if" rather than "when".</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Disagree to the change in wording from 'when' to 'if' since it is considered that the existing wording is sufficient.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
889	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	POLICY AMG5	Object	<p>We would wish AMG5, which makes specific reference to local nature reserves, made reference to a table in which such reserves were listed.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Local Nature Reserves are already shown on the Constraints Map.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
890	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	POLICY AMG5	Object	<p>This policy seeks to protect areas identified in the Plan for their ecological interest.</p> <p>Note that land at the former Dynamex Friction Site, is identified as being within a Wildlife Site (WS) Plas Brereton but is subject to significant levels of contamination requiring remedial works. The policy as drafted does not allow for standard mitigation techniques to be employed to deal with any wildlife or habitats on the site which would be</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The second from last sentence of policy AMG5 refers to 'appropriate mitigation measures'. There is nothing in the policy which prohibits the use of standard mitigation techniques to deal with any wildlife or habitats on the site which would be subject to demolition or remediation works.</p> <p>The specific mitigation measures/methodology would have to be agreed with the LPA case by case basis so as not to adversely impact the sites during such works. This could include the amount of short term (temporary) adverse impact that may be unavoidable to achieve long-term beneficial outcomes.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments & Recommendation
				<p>subject to demolition or remediation works.</p> <p>The Policy therefore does not comply with Test of Soundness C2 as it does not comply with Planning Policy Wales &amp; CE2 as it is not realistic having regard to other alternatives.</p> <p>The policy should be re-written to allow on-site mitigation or other techniques to be utilised as is common practice on previously developed sites and non-statutory protected wildlife sites.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets

### Context and Introduction

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
487	Gwynedd Archaeological planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	7.5.28	Object	What about locally important buildings (local listing?) and or regionally significant monuments, sites or other assets?	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - the list of heritage assets in paragraph 7.5.8 is not exhaustive and does not preclude protection to other types of heritage assets. For example Policy AT3 already covers 'Locally or regionally significant non-designated heritage assets' and 'Policy AT4 'Protection of non-designated archaeological sites'</p> <p>Currently there is no duty for local authorities to prepare a register of locally important buildings. Neither Gwynedd nor Ynys Môn Council prepare such listings.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
501	Gwynedd Archaeological planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	7.5.30	Object	It is worth specifying that Cadw and the Gwynedd Archaeological Trust will be consulted and are stakeholders / partners in this decision making process	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - the number of interests which are consulted on a variety of different types of planning applications is considerable. The land use planning system has a statutory duty to consult with specific interests depending on the type of planning application. Consequently, it is felt that there would be no purpose in repeating the stakeholder/partners within the text of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**PS17 – Preserving and Enhancing Heritage Assets**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
58	Oaktree Environmental Ltd (John Williams) [2594]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS17	Object	<p>Reference to Candidate World Heritage Sites is unnecessary as no World Heritage status will apply to them. It would rather be more practical to change the text referring to specific world heritage sites (criterion 4) to cover World Heritage Sites in general so that if a candidate site is confirmed, it would automatically be covered by criterion 4. To include a specific criterion for candidate sites serves little purpose, given that they have little if any status. Interestingly, no reference is made in detailed policy AT1 to Candidate World Heritage Sites.</p> <p>Re-draft policy to amend criterion 4 to offer coverage for World Heritage Sites in general as opposed to referring to specific sites and removal of criterion 5 which refers to Candidate World Heritage Sites.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Gwynedd Council and its partners are actively preparing a bid DCMS to nominate the slate industry of North Wales for inclusion by UNESCO as a WHS. In order to take the work forward Gwynedd Council and its partners will need to demonstrate at the outset that there are measures in place to facilitate the protection of attributes that will convey the potential outstanding universal value of the area. It is considered that recognition of the candidate WHS status within the JLDP will meet that requirement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
242	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS17	Object	<p>The reference to "other areas of archaeological importance" at point one is not defined. Again this is considered a catch all policy.</p> <p>Suggest removal of "other areas of archaeological importance" be removed from point one given the wide ranging scope and how this might inhibit mineral</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Criterion 1 of PS17 is cross-referenced to policy AT4 and it is considered that it is reasonable to refer "other areas of archaeological importance" within the context of Policy PS17. Policy PS17 provides the context for detailed policy AT4. PS17 and AT4 reflect the importance attached to non-designated archaeological sites to the cultural heritage of the Plan area.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
				extraction development.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
243	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS17	Object	<p>The reference to "other areas of archaeological importance" at point one is not defined. Again this is considered a catch all policy.</p> <p>Suggest removal of "other areas of archaeological importance" be removed from point one given the wide ranging scope and how this might inhibit mineral extraction development.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Criterion 1 of PS17 is cross-referenced to policy AT4 and it is considered that it is reasonable to refer "other areas of archaeological importance" within the context of Policy PS17. Policy PS17 provides the context for detailed policy AT4. PS17 and AT4 reflect the importance attached to non-designated archaeological sites to the cultural heritage of the Plan area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
427	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS17	Support	Ffestiniog Town Council supports the effort to acknowledge the slate areas as a Heritage Site of the World. This would provide economic and social opportunities for these areas that would greatly benefit as a result. This is an excellent way to make the best of the area's natural resources. This would build	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
				on the strengths of the area and the County, giving Wales a special status.	
649	Friends of Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS17	Object	<p>Policies PS17 Borth-y-Gest contains a scheduled ancient monument which is indicated on the constraints map. The Seascope Character Area map referred to in the Deposit Draft includes for the Porthmadog Estuary a list of key scheduled ancient monuments which does not include the "Iron Age to Romano-British hut group" in Parc y Borth. Cadw have recently told us "The monument is of particular interest due to its survival in a lowland area where this type of earth constructed site is rare. It is of national importance for its potential to enhance our knowledge of prehistoric settlement practices. It is an important relic of the prehistoric landscape and retains significant archaeological potential. There is a strong probability of the presence of environmental and structural evidence, including preserved internal and external floor levels."</p> <p>The principle document reference for the study of the site is "PARCYBORTH ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECORDING - G1764 - Report number: 484 - Prepared for Gwynedd Council - MAY2003.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - The Seascope Character Area Study was produced by the Countryside Council for Wales (now part of Natural Resource Wales) and is outside the scope of the JLDP process. However, the site is indicated on the Constraints Map and the protection afforded to Scheduled Ancient Monuments is outlined in Table 25: Schedule of Historic assets of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
				We would wish the site to be specifically mentioned as an important heritage site feature.	
692	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS17	Support	Noting very positive support for slate industry World Heritage Site bid.	<b>Noted.</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
695	Robert Llewelyn Jones [3058]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS17	Object	<p>The need to do something to protect and make these Grade II listed buildings given to the public. They are at present closed to any tourist and locals wishing to have a casual look.</p> <p>I wish to include these very special listed buildings into the plan. Strategic Policy PS 16/17 states that the aim of the plan is to safeguard the Plan area's history and landscape. This area does not appear to be part of our local authority's brief. It is not ring fenced or noted on the plan as being of such significance. I am requesting the area to be ring fenced and noted on the map of the area as being listed buildings.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> - Planning policy in respect of the protection afforded to listed buildings is outlined in Planning Policy Wales and consequently not duplicated in the JLDP. Neither Policy PS17 nor Legislation would be able to change public access being afforded to all Heritage assets. Strategic Plan Policies PS16 and PS17 cover the whole of the Joint Policy Plan Area so there should be no need for any areas to be selected.</p> <p>However it is noted that listed buildings are not shown on the interactive Constraints Map. Including listed buildings on this map will help raise awareness of their presence to potential developers.</p> <p><b>Recommendation -</b></p> <p>No change to the JLDP but include listed buildings on the interactive Constraints Map</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NF 137</b></p>
696	Robert Llewelyn	STRATEGIC	Object	Asking for the Great Breakwater in	<b>Not accepted</b> - Both Beaumaris and Caernarfon castles

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
	Jones [3058]	POLICY PS17		<p>Holyhead to be the same status as the two Heritage castles.</p> <p>That the Constraints Map includes the Great Breakwater at Holyhead and that the building is given a higher profile alongside that of Beaumaris Castle and Caernarfon Castle due to its importance even today to the future of this Port of Holyhead - it is a living, working structure and has been since it was built over 150 years ago.</p>	<p>are UNESCO designated World Heritage Sites. The historical importance of the Great Breakwater in Holyhead is acknowledged as it is a Grade II* listed buildings/structure.</p> <p>However it is noted that listed buildings are not shown on the interactive Constraints Map. Including listed buildings on this map will help raise awareness of their presence to potential developers.</p> <p><b>Recommendation -</b></p> <p>No change to the JLDP but include listed buildings on the interactive Constraints Map</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NF 137</b></p>
1183	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS17	Object	<p>Horizon submits that greater flexibility needs to be included in these policies so that proposals predicted to have an adverse effect will be permissible subject to the identification and implementation of sufficient mitigation measures, supported by an appropriate implementation plan. Rather than seek specific amendments to these policies Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed above which would be the relevant policies against which to make consultation responses to the DCO application and to</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – It is considered that the policy is sufficiently flexible. It is up to developers to demonstrate that their proposals “will preserve and enhance heritage assets, their setting and significant views into and out of the building/area. Like all other developments any proposals arising from the Wylfa Newydd scheme will be required to conform to all relevant policies within the JLDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
				determine its associated development applications.	soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

#### National Development Management Policies

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
488	Gwynedd Archaeological planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	7.5.31	Object	It is worth noting that the archaeological resource is dynamic (as opposed to static) and is constantly developing. New archaeological sites are discovered all the time and new sites of national importance are added to the Schedule of Ancient Monuments as and when they have been assessed and their importance recognised.	<b>Noted</b> - There is no disagreement with this comment. All statutory designations are shown on the Constraints Map, which will be updated within the Plan period to reflect the most up to date information available. <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
653	Cyng/Counc R. Ll. Jones [300]	7.5.31	Object	A more explicit explanation to the para. re 'no statutory requirement' and as to how effective the LDP is in protecting our heritage and listed monuments.  Clearer explanation of the statement as per page 182 and 'statutory requirement.	<b>Accepted in part</b> – The Courts have now accepted that Section 54A of the 1990 TCPA Act (Section 38(6) of the 2004 Act does not apply to applications for Listed Building (LB) or Conservation Area (CA) consent but that development plans should contain policies relevant to development control, decisions which should be taken into account when determining applications for LB/CA consent.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend wording to clarify that this is based on case law.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 87</b></p>
830	Robert Llewelyn Jones [3058]	7.5.31	Object	<p>I am asking for the Constraints Map to show areas of Conservation - SPG plainly. I would not wish to have the same situation happen at Newry Beach again or at any other location on Anglesey. I would say that the Plan is unsound due to the lack of protection for the Conservation Area - Newry/Holyhead Beach.</p> <p>It is very important for the Planning Committee to have easily read planning guidance and not to have to depend on officers to bring them to their notice. The Deposit Plan is not easily understood unless you are willing to spend a lot of time studying it. Make it more 'community friendly' - easily a common reference book for all.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Conservation Areas are already shown in the interactive Constraints Map. Policy AT1, PPW and national guidance and the proposed Heritage Assets SPG will provide the required land use planning policy framework to determine whether a proposal would maintain and enhance conservation areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
489	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	7.5.32	Object	<p>Developers should also take into account the regional HER when formulating proposals if they are to consider the undesignated archaeological resource / historic environment</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Paragraph 7.5.32 refers to the National context outlined in 25. Whilst it is not disputed that Historic Environment Records should be taken into account in the preparation of development proposals, it is considered that issue is best dealt with in the SPG on Heritage Assets which will be prepared within 18 of the Plan's Adoption.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
658	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	7.5.34	Support	<p>We are glad to see the definition of setting as likely to be either limited or wide according to the particular location. This is sensible though it is an aspect of protection which is always going to be difficult to demonstrate. It is well to be prepared for debate.</p> <p>Broad support, but some suggested areas for more detail or emphasis.</p>	<p><b>Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
59	Oaktree Environmental Ltd (John Williams) [2594]	7.5.35	Object	<p>A 'candidate' site may have little status other than that afforded by whatever current designation such a site may benefit from. Given our client's site is a working slate quarry within the proposed World Heritage Site application boundary, the weight attached to any application for World Heritage status should be commensurate with the stage reached in progressing the application.</p> <p>Clarify what weight will be given to</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Gwynedd Council and its partners are actively preparing a bid DCMS to nominate the slate industry of North Wales for inclusion by UNESCO as a WHS. In order to take the work forward Gwynedd Council and its partners will need to demonstrate at the outset that there are measures in place to facilitate the protection of attributes that will convey the potential outstanding universal value of the area. It is considered that recognition of the candidate WHS status within the JLDP will meet that requirement.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
				candidate site status when considering development proposals and whether that weight will increase as the World Heritage Site application progresses.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**AT1 – Conservation Areas, World Heritage Sites and Registered Historic Landscapes, Parks and Gardens**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
673	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	7.5.37	Object	<p>The content of the Assessment is not indicated in any detail. The possible impact on underlying remains and archaeological information should be remembered, alongside matters of style and materials.</p> <p>Broad support, but some suggested areas for more detail or emphasis.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> –It is considered that the contents/format of Heritage Impact Assessment should be covered within the proposed SPG as opposed to the JLDP itself. An indication of the issues that will need to be covered is set out in paragraph 7.5.39 of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation -</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**AT3 – Locally or Regionally Significant Non-Designated Heritage Assets**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
362	Mr Geoff Wood [2916]	POLICY AT3	Object	<p>In some circumstances, it may be appropriate to protect a heritage asset and / or preserve Welsh culture by bringing a building back into active use where the building is in a poor state of repair or is in a derelict state but still standing.</p> <p>Amend part 1 to state "The sympathetic re-use and repair of redundant, derelict and under-used historic buildings and areas which are consistent with their conservation;"</p>	<p><b>Noted</b> – Policy AT3 already facilitates the re-use of a heritage asset provided this is undertaken in a sympathetic manner. A range of policies in the Plan will provide the relevant framework relating to the proposed use e.g. TAI19, which requires a 'structurally sound building'.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
495	Gwynedd Archaeological planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	POLICY AT3	Object	<p>Interpretation, management, access, public engagement and other educational benefits should also be considered alongside reuse of historic buildings, archaeological sites, monuments and other historic assets</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Agree that management and drawing the public and owner's attention to the value of local heritage assets are important. The Councils will engage with the Gwynedd Archaeological Trust to develop the Heritage Assets SPG accordingly.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change to the Plan but to consult with the Gwynedd Archaeological Trust to develop the Heritage Assets SPG.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
675	Campaign for the	POLICY AT3	Object	The explanation to this policy is sensible	<b>Accepted</b> - it is agreed that the wording could be

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
	Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]			and clear but the policy itself is poorly phrased and consequently not easy to understand. There is a bit too much about 'enhancement' which might result in the loss of true historic character if it was not made more clear that this is a conservation policy.  Broad support, but some suggested areas for more detail or emphasis.	amended in order to clarify the scope of the policy. However, it is considered important to ensure that any changes to the policy does not weaken the 'positive approach' to the protection of non-designated heritage assets which the JLDP aims to promote.  <b>Recommendation</b>  Amend the wording of the policy.  <b>Focussed Change - NF 88</b>
499	Gwynedd Archaeological planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	7.5.43	Support	The archaeological resource is dynamic with new discoveries being made and reported regularly (over 2000 new records are added to the regional Historic Environment Record annually).	<b>Noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### AT4 – Protection or Non-Designated Archaeological Sites

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
244	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY AT4	Object	Mineral extraction sites by their very nature may have some effect on non-designated archaeological sites. The policy is considered too unwieldy, the words "may" and "potential" are not definitive.	<b>Not accepted</b> – Mineral extraction should not be treated differently to any other form of development. This policy is consistent with paragraph 6.4.2 which states that "Not all nationally important remains meriting preservation will necessarily be scheduled. Such remains and, in appropriate circumstances, other unscheduled archaeological remains of more local importance, and

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
				Would suggest the policy is deleted and is covered by pre-application decision and the local list to requires and archaeological assessment where defined archaeological interest are located and/or cover by planning condition.	<p>their settings, may also be identified in development plans as particularly worthy of preservation.”</p> <p>This policy provides clear guidance of what is expected in relation to potentially significant non-designated archaeological sites.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
245	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY AT4	Object	<p>Mineral extraction sites by their very nature may have some effect on non-designated archaeological sites. The policy is considered too unwieldy, the words “may” and “potential” are not definitive.</p> <p>Would suggest the policy is deleted and is covered by pre-application decision and the local list to require an archaeological assessment where defined archaeological interest are located and/or cover by planning condition.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Mineral extraction should not be treated differently to any other form of development. This policy is consistent with paragraph 6.4.2 of PPW which states that “Not all nationally important remains meriting preservation will necessarily be scheduled. Such remains and, in appropriate circumstances, other unscheduled archaeological remains of more local importance, and their settings, may also be identified in development plans as particularly worthy of preservation.”</p> <p>This policy provides clear guidance of what is expected in relation to potentially significant non-designated archaeological sites.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
494	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	POLICY AT4	Object	Where the remains are not considered to be of national importance and their protection ('preservation in situ') is not considered appropriate (by the LPA and their archaeological advisors ) then alternative mitigation ('preservation by record') will be the appropriate course of action in accordance with circular 60/96. Post-excavation, publication and dissemination of results must be ensured with an emphasis on public benefit, particularly educational benefits to the local community. All work should be in accordance with the standards set by the Chartered Institute for Archaeologists	<p><b>Accepted</b> - It is considered that this issue is covered in the last sentence of policy AT4 and paragraph 7.5.46 However to explain the requirement of the policy its considered that appropriate wording on the lines suggested by the Objector should be included at the end of paragraph 7.5.6 and further detail included in the SPG on Heritage Assets which will be prepared within 18 months of the Plan's Adoption.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Include appropriate wording on the lines suggested by the Objector at the end of paragraph 7.5.46.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change - NF 89</b></p>
496	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	7.5.45	Object	Archaeological potential needs to be considered. Archaeological potential can often be inferred rather than just reacting to known archaeological sites. For example larger scale developments have the potential to reveal new archaeological information across landscapes where the current knowledge	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Whilst the comment is accepted policy AT4 already refers to 'sites of potential national importance'. Consequently it is felt that those types of archaeological sites referred by the objector can be adequately covered by policy AT4.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer's Comments and Recommendation
				base might be limited. In these circumstances, even where there is limited existing evidence, archaeological evaluation may be required to establish an evidence baseline. Also, the archaeological resource is dynamic and the number, location, distribution of archaeological sites increases all the time.	No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

## Waste Management

### PS18 – Waste Management

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
444	Mon a Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills) [2937]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS18	Object	Strategic Policy PS18, and the associated policies, should make reference to waste minimisation and reduction strategies, reflecting targets in The Waste Prevention Programme for Wales. The JLDP should encourage or compel developers to avoid waste, and to re-use and recycle waste generated during the demolition and/or construction phase.	<b>Not accepted</b> - Issue has been adequately addressed in Policy PS5: Sustainable Development  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
807	Ty Mawr West Ltd (John Hill) [3062]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS18	Object	PS18 Waste Management. The waste hierarchy should include a provision for the appropriate use of suitable inert waste arising to be employed in the prudent restoration of previously disturbed land.	<b>Not accepted</b> - Issue of inert materials used in recovery as opposed to waste disposal operations already addressed in Paragraph 4.23 of TAN 21: Waste (Welsh Assembly Government). National Policy shouldn't be reiterated within the Local Development Plan.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
987	Welsh Slate Ltd [3147]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS18	Object	Whilst the Company supports the general strategy it is of the opinion that clear reference should be made to the use of suitable inert wastes in the restoration of previously disturbed land from whatever previous user.	<b>Not accepted</b> - Issue of inert materials used in recovery as opposed to waste disposal operations already addressed in Paragraph 4.23 of TAN 21: Waste (Welsh Assembly Government). National Policy shouldn't be reiterated within the Local Development Plan.



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### GWA1 – Provision of Waste Management and Recycling Infrastructure

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
374	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY GWA1	Object	The Penygroes site includes land designated as a local WS, this should be removed from the development boundary. This would also provide a buffer between the waste site and adjacent river	<p><b>Do not accept</b> - Wildlife Sites are places that are considered to be of local importance for their biodiversity value. They are non-statutory sites that are not designated under any specific law but a suite of policies and legislation.</p> <p>It is recognised that there are local biodiversity value to the most easterly part of the site which has been allocated. It is considered that there are sufficient policies within the Plan which will give due consideration to the biodiversity value of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the site during the planning application process.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
492	Mon a Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills) [2937]	POLICY GWA1	Object	The list of sites for waste management and recycling infrastructure should be reformulated to take account for the scope to embed within communities smart closed-loop waste management facilities, recognising the importance attributed to these facilities in "Towards Zero Waste" and the Municipal Sector Plan.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Issue has been adequately addressed in Policy PS5: Sustainable Development</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1447	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio)	POLICY GWA1	Support	NRW welcomes that this Policy allows for waste management facilities on some employment allocations.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[1521]				

#### GWA2 – Waste Management Outside Development Boundaries and Allocated Sites

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1448	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY GWA2	Object	GWA2, does not set out how the 7 year and 5 year trigger points in relation to the supply of landfill will be monitored and how the LPA will work with other Authorities to meet this need, if required. It is acknowledged that landfill has a diminishing role but the Plan should acknowledge the need for regional collaboration to meet the need for landfill across North Wales and how it will work with other authorities to meet this need. This should be set out in the policy to accord with TAN21.	<p><b>Accept</b> – Further clarification should be included which will emphasise the need for collaboration and monitoring. Include a new paragraph after 7.5.55.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure the accuracy of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change – NF90</b></p>

#### GWA3 – Low and Very Low Level Radioactive Waste Treatment and Storage

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
615	Cyng/Counc R. Ll. Jones [300]	POLICY GWA3	Object	This policy is leaving the residents of Anglesey and Gwynedd in danger of becoming the	<b>Accept in Part</b> - There are current producers of low and very low radioactive waste within the Plan area, which include

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>dumping ground for radioactive waste, treatment and storage. The statement that low level radiation generated in existing businesses is made. Does this rule out the new nuclear plant that is being proposed or is it only our present Wylfa A that this applies to? Our County Council have not voted to store radioactive material on site and this should be made clear in the Policy GWA3.</p> <p>Changes to Plan Clarification on the storage of nuclear waste and how the policies refer to the proposed Wylfa Newydd</p>	<p>the current Nuclear Power Station at Wylfa. Most disposal of LLW requires a permit under the radioactive waste regulations to be held by both the waste producer and the operator of the waste facility that receives it – the treatment of the Low and Very Low Radioactive Waste is therefore tightly managed and regulated.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity it is recommended that a definition of what is meant by Low and Very Low Level Radioactive waste is included.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change – NF91</b></p>
796	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	POLICY GWA3	Object	<p>Page 191 GWA3 is a policy for radioactive waste treatment and storage. This highlights one of the main problems of having a nuclear power station. The waste is extremely hazardous and difficult dangerous and had to store. The radioactive waste cannot be neutralized, when the half-life of Plutonium is 24,000 years.</p> <p>Change to Plan</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Radioactive waste is a conserving issue and including further clarification with regard to what is meant by the term low and very low radioactive waste would be beneficial.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity it is recommended that a definition of what is meant by Low and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				There is a need for the definition of low level and very low level radioactive waste; what type of radioactive waste? I suggest that if this policy is retained it must lists which radioactive isotopes e.g. plutonium 239. If a radioactive waste is required to be stored it should be stored at the power station.	Very Low Level Radioactive waste is included.  <b>Focussed Change – NF91</b>

## Minerals

### PS19 – Minerals

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
246	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS19	Object	Suggest hierarchy to support existing mineral extraction sites, then extensions to existing sites before new sites are considered. It is considered however the Council should maintain a MINIMUM 7 year land bank for Sand and Gravel at all times. Alternative restoration plans should be considered outside the traditional return to greenfield sites. Dormant and long inactive sites should be considered a potential valuable source of mineral that can be called upon when demand is high and a land bank is not fully available.	<b>Not accepted</b> - Point 9 reflects the requirements of Welsh Government Minerals Planning Policy, the relevant guidance in MTAN 1: Aggregates & The Regional Technical Statement on Aggregates (First Review 2014).  Suggestion of a hierarchy not sustainable as each site is assessed on it's own merit in accordance with all of the policies included within the Plan as well as national policies.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Promotion of existing mineral extraction sites and extensions to these sites should be promoted above any new sites. It is considered the Council should maintain a MINIMUM 7 year land bank for Sand and Gravel at all times and there should be a positive presumption toward mineral extraction particularly at existing sites. Actively encourage alternative after uses for mineral extractions sites over the return to greenfield where appropriate. Remove point 9.</p>	<p>It is considered that landbank issues are sufficiently addressed in the policy.</p> <p>Alternative restoration plans may include for amenity &amp; biodiversity interests but the comment is vague with respect to any proposed uses. Any afteruse proposals must comply with the policies and objectives of the Local Development Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
247	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS19	Object	<p>Suggest hierarchy to support existing mineral extraction sites, then extensions to existing sites before new sites are considered. It is considered however the Council should maintain a MINIMUM 10 year land bank of crushed rock at all times. Alternative restoration plans should be considered outside the traditional return to greenfield sites.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Point 9 reflects the requirements of Welsh Government Minerals Planning Policy, the relevant guidance in MTAN 1: Aggregates &amp; The Regional Technical Statement on Aggregates (First Review 2014).</p> <p>Suggestion of a hierarchy not sustainable as each site is assessed on it's own merit in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>accordance with all of the policies included within the Plan as well as national policies.</p> <p>It is considered that landbank issues are sufficiently addressed in the policy.</p> <p>Alternative restoration plans may include for amenity &amp; biodiversity interests but the comment is vague with respect to any proposed uses. Any afteruse proposals must comply with the policies and objectives of the local development plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
502	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS19	Support	restoration and aftercare needs to be considered in the context of the historically important quarries and historically significant slate tips for example	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
594	The Coal Authority (Mr James Smith) [2998]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS19	Object	<p>Policy PS19 fails to make reference to potential proposals for hydrocarbons and unconventional hydrocarbons</p> <p>Suggested Changes Reference should be made in Policy PS19 to the need for any proposals which come forward for conventional and unconventional hydrocarbons to be considered in accordance with national policies and guidance.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Energy policies are specifically included in section 7.2 of the document, Living Sustainably where paragraph 7.2.1 sets out the context of addressing sustainable development and climate change.</p> <p>Also WG position on 'hydraulic fracking' set out in the Notification Direction Feb 2015, (<i>The Town and Country Planning (Notification) (Unconventional Oil and Gas) (Wales) Direction 2015</i>).</p> <p>Not considered that there is sufficient evidence or justification to provide a special case for hydrocarbons and unconventional hydrocarbons under the policy framework to cover potential proposals for Shale GAS and/or Coalbed Methane extraction in the plan area.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
619	Mineral Products Association (Mr Malcolm Ratcliff) [1647]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS19	Object	<p>STRATEGIC POLICY PS19 MINERALS</p> <p>this policy is in danger of confusing separate objectives of mineral planning by putting them under the general heading of supply and is thus unsound</p> <p>We suggest the reordering of the policy as follows,</p> <p>The Councils will contribute to regional and local demand for a continuous, secure and sustainable supply of minerals by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Maintaining a minimum 7 year land bank of Sand and Gravel and minimum 10 year land bank of crushed rock aggregate reserves throughout the plan period in line with national guidance.</li> <li>2. Making provision for the production of dimension stone.</li> <li>3. Making provision for the production of industrial minerals.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Partly accept</b> - It is not considered that the reference to 'supply' makes the policy unsound or incoherent and does not preclude minerals development for the extraction of dimension stone or industrial minerals. However, Mineral Planning Authorities have a statutory obligation through the RAWPS and in accordance with MPPW and the provisions of the North Wales Regional Technical Statement to maintain a landbank of aggregate reserves and this is the reason for its inclusion in the policy criterion.</p> <p>The policy specifically refers to the, 'sustainable supply of minerals' as opposed to aggregates. The supporting text makes it clear that building stone and industrial minerals are also important. There is no need therefore to include the insertion, '<i>making provision for the production of dimension stone/industrial minerals</i>' as a separate category.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>4. Maximising the use of secondary and recycled materials and mineral wastes for which appropriate provision will be made in land allocations</p> <p>5. Acknowledging that where the principles of sustainable development can be achieved, the extension of existing quarries and/or new quarries is likely to be appropriate.</p> <p>6. Requiring that where there is a need for new capacity of minerals, these should come from locations of low environmental constraint and take into account transport implications.</p> <p>7. Minimising potential conflict between mineral and non-mineral land uses.</p> <p>The Councils will safeguarding known / potential mineral resources from permanent development that would sterilize them or hinder extraction and protect maritime wharf and railhead facilities as a means of encouraging sustainable transport of aggregates.</p>	<p>It is considered that Strategic Policy PS19 reflects the requirements of paragraph 10 of MPPW, under the heading of; ‘Key Objectives/principles of sustainable mineral development’, where amongst other requirements, the following key principles are listed;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide mineral resources to meet society’s needs and to safeguard resources from sterilisation,</li> <li>• Achieve high standard restoration and beneficial afteruse.</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>For clarity the wording of the policy could be slightly amended.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change – NF92</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>The Councils will ensure good restoration and aftercare.</p> <p>All Dormant and long-inactive minerals sites identified on the proposals map will be reviewed to assess their potential to contribute to the land bank and the likelihood of their re-opening. Where appropriate, Prohibition Orders will be served.</p>	
659	Ty Mawr West Ltd (John Hill) [3062]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS19	Object	<p>PS19 Minerals -Slate Waste</p> <p>The summary relating to the rail connection at Blaenau Ffestiniog does not portray the total facts of the matter. Yes there is a passenger rail connection but the rail infrastructure itself is unsuitable for the passage of heavy goods wagons which remedial works would require major expenditure</p>	<p><b>Not accepted:</b> Rail transport of aggregates reflects the principles of sustainable development and provides viable alternatives to road haulage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**MWYN1 – Safeguarding Mineral Resources**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
248	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN1	Object	<p>The policy is supported to ensure a steady and continued supply of aggregates. In order to comply with Mineral Planning Policy Wales the Council should maintain a MINIMUM 7 year landbank of sand and gravel at all times.</p> <p>It is considered the Council should maintain a MINIMUM 7 year land bank for Sand and Gravel at all times and there should be a positive presumption toward mineral extraction particularly at existing sites.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Policy Mwyn 1 reflects the requirements of Welsh Government Minerals Planning Policy, the relevant guidance in MTAN 1: Aggregates &amp; The Regional Technical Statement on Aggregates (First Review 2014).</p> <p>Landbank is sufficiently addressed in Policy PS19</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
249	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY MWYN1	Object	<p>The policy is supported to ensure a steady and continued supply of aggregates. In order to comply with Mineral Planning Policy Wales the Council should maintain a MINIMUM 10 year landbank of crushed rock at all times. This would obviously be beneficial from existing quarries.</p> <p>The Council should maintain a MINIMUM 10 year land bank of crushed rock at all times and there should be a positive presumption toward mineral extraction particularly at existing sites. Request that existing Sandstone and Dolerite Category 1</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Policy Mwyn 1 reflects the requirements of Welsh Government Minerals Planning Policy, the relevant guidance in TAN 1: Aggregates &amp; The Regional Technical Statement on Aggregates (First Review 2014).</p> <p>Landbank is sufficiently addressed in Policy PS19</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				be included within the Safeguarding Area.	No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
600	The Coal Authority (Mr James Smith) [2998]	POLICY MWYN1	Object	<p>The Coal Authority considers that insufficient evidence has been provided to justify the omission of a Mineral Safeguarding Area covering the Caernarfon coalfield which does not appear to be located within an area covered by any International or National designations.</p> <p>Change requested A Mineral Safeguarding Area covering the Caernarfon coalfield should be included on the Proposals Map.</p>	<b>Not accepted</b> - Given both historic and recent geotechnical information it remains that very little is known about the coal resource only that it would appear to be overlain with a substantial layer of very hard granites on the northern extent which is consistent with the information contained on the 2010 BGS publication, 'Minerals Resource Map of Wales. It appears that the entire coal resource lies underneath; <i>other igneous rocks including basalts, felsites, gabbros, tuffs and granites</i> ', and the potential for any coal extraction is constrained by the overlying geology and commercial exploitation therefore appears to be low. On balance, it is not considered that the coal resource north-east of Caernarfon should be safeguarded on the LDP Proposals or

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Constraints maps.</p> <p>An enquiry was submitted to Welsh Government Transport Department in respect of any geotechnical surveys prepared in advance of the proposed Bontnewydd bypass. In response, it was confirmed that a series of boreholes had been carried out in the vicinity of the coal resource where it is intersected by the line of the protected route, but at the time of writing this response, the borehole logs have not been published for inspection.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
620	Mineral Products Association (Mr Malcolm	POLICY MWYN1	Object	Could not find any reference to Mineral Safeguarding Areas on either the Proposals Map or its Key. Consider the proposed criteria for assessing non-mineral development are incoherent. The deficiencies of the policy are that	<p><b>Partly accept</b> - The MSAs are actually included on the constraints map and the wording of the policy should be amended accordingly to refer to the '<i>constraints</i>', as</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Ratcliff) [1647]			<p>it does not specify a minerals report which should provide information on the quantity and quality of mineral potentially sterilised; it does not distinguish between forms of permanent development that pose a real risk to mineral sterilisation and those like minor applications, that do not; and it does not require that a statement of relative need between the mineral and the proposed development is submitted for the mpa to make a judgement of the planning balance.</p> <p>Detailed replacement policy provided (see attachment)</p>	<p>opposed to the '<i>proposals</i>' map.</p> <p>In terms of how development should be managed in MSAs, most of the mineral resources are located outside of urban areas and potential allocations in the LDP, and there is therefore very limited scope for conflicting development in such areas.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity the wording of the policy should refer to 'Constraint Map' as opposed to 'Proposal Map'.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB20</b></p>

#### MWYN2 – Sustainable Supply of Mineral Resources

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
250	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN2	Object	There should be a positive policy presumption in favour of pursuing extensions to existing and new sites.	<b>Not accepted</b> - It is considered that the issue has been adequately addressed in the response to Policy PS19 & Mwyn 1.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				The policy should encourage sites to come forward with extensions to existing sites preferred over new sites.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
251	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY MWYN2	Object	<p>There should be a positive policy presumption in favour of pursuing extensions to existing sites.</p> <p>The policy should encourage sites to come forward with extensions to existing sites preferred over new sites.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is considered that the issue has been adequately addressed in the response to Policy PS19 &amp; Mwyn 1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
621	Mineral Products Association (Mr Malcolm Ratcliff) [1647]	POLICY MWYN2	Object	<p>In view of the fact that the size of the landbank to be secured by policy is indicated in sufficient detail in policy PS19 we question whether this policy is necessary and is not a duplication. It thus fails soundness test CE1.</p> <p>We suggest it is deleted.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – It is agreed that Policy MWYN2 is a duplication of strategic policy PS19 and that it should be deleted.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To remove undue repetition Policy MWYN2 will be deleted and the explanation</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>paragraph will be included within the introduction to the Minerals section of the plan (after para 7.5.61).</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB19, NF93</b></p>
321	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	7.5.66	Object	The landbank requirement needs to be expressed as a minimum of 7 years for sand and gravel and a minimum of 10 years for crushed rock at all times through the plan and at the end of the plan. There is inference that no additional reserves in addition to the minimum landbanks would be consented.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The explanation paragraph reflects the requirements of Welsh Government Minerals Planning Policy, the relevant guidance in MTAN 1: Aggregates &amp; The Regional Technical Statement on Aggregates (First Review 2014).</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
378	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	7.5.66	Object	The landbank requirement needs to be expressed as a minimum of 7 years for sand and gravel and a minimum of 10 years for crushed rock at all times through the plan and at the end of the plan. There is inference that no additional reserves in addition to the minimum landbanks would be consented.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The explanation paragraph reflects the requirements of Welsh Government Minerals Planning Policy, the relevant guidance in MTAN 1: Aggregates &amp; The Regional Technical Statement on</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				The paragraph text should be amended to express landbank as a minimum of 7 years for sand and gravel and a minimum of 10 years for crushed rock at all times.	<p>Aggregates (First Review 2014).</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### MWYN3 – Preferred Areas of Search

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
252	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN3	Object	The preferred area of search at Bodychain, Llanllyfni is identified in the written policy but not on the proposals map. It should be shown on the proposals map. There is significant commercial potential for the resource and planning might reasonably be anticipated. It should therefore be a Preferred Area to be worked as an extension to Cefn Graiainog. This would potentially overcome the significant shortfall. The precise working area would be informed by EIA. The resource block at	<p><b>Accepted</b> – There is a mapping error which needs to be corrected and the Preferred Areas need to be shown on the proposal map.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy Bodychain Farm, Llanllyfni, Derwyn fawr, Garndolbenmaen and Llecheiddior Uchaf, Garndolbenmaen will need to be shown on the proposal</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Llanllyfni and Cae Efa Lwyd, Penygroes is supported as an Area of Search.	map as Preferred Areas. <b>Focus Change: NF135</b>
348	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY MWYN3	Object	The preferred area of search to the north and north-west of Rhuddlan Bach quarry includes land within our ownership. We object to its inclusion with the AoS and note that the land is currently managed by us as part of and a buffer to the adjacent Cors Goch Ramsar site/SAC/SSSI/NNR. We would under no circumstances permit quarrying on our land.	<b>Not Accepted</b> – The designation recognises the mineral resource only, it doesn't necessarily mean that the site will ever be developed. <b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness. <b>No Change</b>
622	Mineral Products Association (Mr Malcolm Ratcliff) [1647]	POLICY MWYN3	Object	This policy is deficient in confusing terminology mentioned in national policy. The objection is not to the sites listed but to the way they are referred to. The policy uses the term 'preferred areas of search'. This confuses two completely different and distinct types of mineral provision in Local Plans which it is important to maintain.  Suggested Changes At present we suggest the dropping of the word	<b>Accepted</b> – The current terminology which is used is confusing as the policy appears to merge two completely different and distinct types of mineral provision as 'Preferred Areas of Search'.  The identification of 'preferred areas of search' should be reviewed in accordance with the best available information and the following criteria;

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				'preferred' from areas of search to align more closely with national policy. However, whilst we ask for further clarification about the mineral site strategy we are unable to make any suggestions for changes at this time.	<p><b>Preferred Areas</b> (<i>"areas of known resources with some commercial potential, and where planning permission might reasonably be anticipated"</i>), within which operators should be encouraged to bring forward more specific proposals.</p> <p><b>Areas of Search</b> (<i>"...broad areas that are believed to contain mineral resources of commercial significance but whose extent is uncertain..."</i>).</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy the and to demonstrate that appropriate regard is made to national Policy and guidance the term 'Preferred Areas of search' will be amended to read 'Preferred Areas'.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB21</b></p>
1812	Gwasanaeth Cynllunio Mwynau &	POLICY MWYN3	Object	The mineral safeguarding areas (Policy MWYN1) do not appear on the proposal map on Gwynedd Council's website nor do the sand and gravel	<b>Accepted</b> – There is a mapping error which needs to be corrected and the Preferred Areas need to be shown on the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Gwastraff Gogledd Cymru (Dafydd Gareth Jones) [2578]			<p>preferred areas of search referred to in policy MWYN 3.</p> <p>Inconsistency with the preferred areas of search for sand and grain in Policy MWYN3 and Proposals Map 1.</p> <p>Need to update the safeguarding mineral areas identified on Proposals Map 1.</p> <p>Notation for some of the constraints maps is hard to interpret, e.g. safeguarding sand and gravel where the area crosses other denotations such as 'special landscape areas'.</p> <p>Proposed Changes Need to include all preferred areas of search that have been identified for sand and gravel in Policy MWYN3 on Proposals Map 1, i.e. ensure that the following areas are marked on the proposals map as well as those that have already been included, namely; Bodychain Farm, Llanllyfni, Derwyn Fawr, Gandolbenmaen, Llecheiddior Uchaf, Gandolbenmaen.</p>	<p>proposal map.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy Bodychain Farm, Llanllyfni, Derwyn fawr, Gandolbenmaen and Llecheiddior Uchaf, Gandolbenmaen will need to be shown on the proposal map as Preferred Areas.</p> <p>Nanhoron and Nant Gwrtheyrn should also be shown on the proposal maps as mineral working sites.</p> <p><b>Focus Change: NF135, NF136</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Update the mineral sites identified on Proposals Map 1 to include Nanhoron Quarry and Nant Gwrtheyrn working mineral deposits. The situation also needs to be reviewed to include new back-up quarries (if approved), but also the practicality of including small sites such as Nant Gwrtheyrn and the submission of Prohibition Orders to recommence mining on any 'dormant' mineral site, e.g. Dorothea Quarry.</p> <p>The mineral safeguarding areas (Policy MWYN1) need to be included on the interactive map as well all the sand and gravel preferred areas of search referred to in policy MWYN3.</p>	
314	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	7.5.67	Object	<p>There is a reasonable likelihood of the LDP failing to achieve a minimum 10 year landbank for crushed rock in Gwynedd. The recessionary 10 years upon which demand has been calculated is likely to be an underestimate. It does not reflect the major infrastructure projects identified in the RTS. The landbank calculation is flawed by combining slate with primary aggregates. Slate accounts for between 11.7% and 14.8% aggregates usage. The calculated landbank has a higher and disproportionate contribution from slate. The</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - High specification aggregates are safeguarded on the proposal map.</p> <p>Policy reflects regional apportionment as recommended in the RTS.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>constraints on using slate as highlighted in the RTS have not been properly considered. Strategically important high Specification Aggregates require recognition.</p> <p>Changes to Plan</p> <p>See suggested revised policy in attachment</p>	<b>No Change</b>
372	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	7.5.68	Object	<p>There may not be sufficient information to support allocations for Specific Sites. There is though sufficient information on Bodychain, Llanllyfni for it to be promoted as a Preferred Area.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – There is a mapping error which needs to be corrected and the Preferred Areas need to be shown on the proposal map.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy Bodychain Farm, Llanllyfni, Derwyn fawr, Garndolbenmaen and Llecheiddior Uchaf, Garndolbenmaen will need to be shown on the proposal map as Preferred Areas.</p> <p><b>Focus Change: NF135</b></p>

MWYN4 – Mineral Developments

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
254	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN4	Object	Policy is overly prescriptive rather than supportive of mineral winning e.g. not all landscapes, biodiversity and other assets are of the same value. It applies a blanket protection of all assets. There is no consideration in the policy of the benefits of mineral extraction to local economy, employment or the restored environment.	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – The Policy reflects current criteria-based assessments considered with all mineral developments.</p> <p>It is however accepted that the policy could make reference to the economic and environmental benefits which may occur from mineral workings.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity reference will be made within the explanation to the policy to the economic and environmental benefit which arise from mineral workings.</p> <p><b>Focus Change: NF95</b></p>
255	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY MWYN4	Object	Policy is overly prescriptive rather than supportive of mineral winning e.g. not all landscapes, biodiversity and other assets are of the same value. It applies a blanket protection of all assets. There is	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – The Policy reflects current criteria-based assessments considered with all mineral</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				no consideration in the policy of the benefits of mineral extraction to local economy, employment or the restored environment.	<p>developments.</p> <p>It is however accepted that the policy could make reference to the economic and environmental benefits which may occur from mineral workings.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity reference will be made within the explanation to the policy to the economic and environmental benefit which arise from mineral workings.</p> <p><b>Focus Change: NF95</b></p>
503	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	POLICY MWYN4	Object	Screening and landscaping only where appropriate. Needs to be some recognition that quarry tips themselves are often of historic importance	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Policy reflects current criteria-based assessments considered with all mineral developments. Slate tips form an integral component of the Register of Historic Landscapes which fall within the scope of the policy criteria.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
505	Gwynedd Archaeological planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	POLICY MWYN4	Object	What is meant by 'environmental capacity'?	<p><b>Partly accepted</b> - Environmental capacity under criterion 7 is a concept of strategic mineral planning and possibly beyond the remit of local planning policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy reference to 'environmental capacity' will be deleted as it is beyond the remit of the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p><b>Focus Change: NF94</b></p>
623	Mineral Products Association (Mr Malcolm Ratcliff) [1647]	POLICY MWYN4	Object	<p>POLICY MWYN4: MINERAL DEVELOPMENTS</p> <p>This policy is unsound because it fails soundness test CE1. The following criteria are the subject of objection,</p> <p>1. We question whether the inclusion of odour in the list of amenity effects relates to minerals at all.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – The reference to 'odour' within the Policy should be deleted as it isn't a relevant issue with regard to mineral working.</p> <p>Environmental capacity under criterion 7</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Surely, this is limited to the deposit of waste? 7. We object to the inclusion of this criterion because we believe it is not needed since all aspects of the environment are already covered by other criteria in the policy ad it thus serves no useful purpose because an overall assessment of all environmental effects would be carried out in the determination process. It is moreover, notoriously difficult to define environmental capacity for all types of effects for which the concept is unsuited.</p> <p>Changes to Plan See suggested revised policy in attachment</p>	<p>is a concept of strategic mineral planning and possibly beyond the remit of local planning policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy reference to 'odour' in criterion 1 will be deleted and criterion 7 will be deleted.</p> <p><b>Focus Change: NF94</b></p>
875	Mr John Tripp [252]	POLICY MWYN4	Object	<p>Criterion 2 - Safeguarding mineral assets. Use of slate waste. Restoration - legal and financial restraints (cite South Wales - open cast)</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Comment as opposed to objection.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
317	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited	7.5.71	Object	<p>There is no recognition of the economic, social, employment benefits that can arise from mineral</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> - It is accepted that the policy could make reference to the economic</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2735]			working. Or that minerals development can and often does result in a net benefit to biodiversity and other local assets. Acknowledgment is required that minerals working often makes a positive contribution to the local economy, habitats and the environment.	and environmental benefits which may occur from mineral workings.  <b>Recommendation</b>  To ensure clarity reference will be made within the explanation to the policy to the economic and environmental benefit which arise from mineral workings.  <b>Focus Change: NF95</b>
380	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	7.5.71	Object	There is no recognition of the economic, social, employment benefits that can arise from mineral working. Or that minerals development can and often does result in a net benefit to biodiversity and other local assets.	<b>Accepted</b> - It is accepted that the policy could make reference to the economic and environmental benefits which may occur from mineral workings.  <b>Recommendation</b>  To ensure clarity reference will be made within the explanation to the policy to the economic and environmental benefit which arise from mineral workings.  <b>Focus Change: NF95</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
507	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	7.5.71	Object	The setting of Snowdonia National Park should also be considered in relation to proposals adjacent to the park.	<p><b>Accepted</b> – The explanation text to the policy should make reference to the setting of Snowdonia National Park.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy the explanation text will be amended to include reference to the Snowdonia National Park Authority.</p> <p><b>Minor Change: NB22</b></p>

#### MWYN5 – Local Building Stone

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
624	Mineral Products Association (Mr Malcolm Ratcliff) [1647]	POLICY MWYN5	Object	<p>we very much doubt that any building stone quarry operated to modern professional and sustainable standards can meet the requirements of the policy</p> <p>The policy as drafted does not in our opinion provide a realistic prospect to encourage new dimension stone operations, although it may allow continuation of existing ones. An application for more than a small operation (undefined) proposing to serve a wider market not limited to the heritage market by building a sustainable local business would</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - It is considered that these comments have taken Policy Mwyn 5 out of context. The objectives of policy Mwyn 5 recognises the importance of traditional building materials in local heritage with the temporary working or re-opening of small-scale mineral operations in the interests of building conservation, where it can be demonstrated that the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>undoubtedly fail. As would an application that produced material already available even if in tiny quantities from another site. There is no reason adduced that would justify such draconian and punitive conditions.</p> <p>Changes to Plan We suggest the following changes to the policy The working or reopening of mineral operations to provide traditional building materials will be granted provided that: It is compatible with other Plan policies</p>	<p>need for such materials cannot be met from existing reserves/resources.</p> <p>As stated previously, Policy PS19 specifically refers to the, 'sustainable supply of minerals' as opposed to aggregates and does not preclude minerals development for the extraction of dimension stone.</p> <p>There is sufficient provision therefore to consider large-scale and long-term mineral working for dimension stone under policy PS19 &amp; policy Mwyn 4 under the general heading of 'Mineral Developments'</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**MWYN6 – Buffer Zones Around Mineral Sites**

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
258	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN6	Object	Buffer zone guidance is set out in Mineral Planning Policy Wales (2000) and the Aggregates Technical Advice Note (2004). Although for sand and gravel quarries 100m is the defined standoff from sensitive development this is defined as any building occupied by people on a regular basis and includes housing areas, hostels, meeting places, schools and hospitals where an acceptable standard of amenity should be expected. Where there is very limited impact from the mineral extraction site the 100m buffer zone may be reduced.	<p><b>Partly agree</b> – Reference within the policy could be made to circumstances where there is an element of flexibility when considering the buffer zones in accordance with MTAN1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity the policy will be amended to refer to circumstances where there may be a justifiable reason for reducing the distance.</p> <p><b>Focused Change: NF96</b></p>
259	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY MWYN6	Object	Buffer zone guidance is set out in Mineral Planning Policy Wales (2000) and the Aggregates Technical Advice Note (2004). Although for hard rock quarries 200m is the defined standoff from sensitive development this is defined as any building occupied by people on a regular basis and includes housing areas, hostels, meeting places, schools and hospitals where an acceptable standard of amenity should be expected. Where there is very limited impact from the mineral extraction site the 200m buffer zone	<p><b>Partly agree</b> – Reference within the policy could be made to circumstances where there is an element of flexibility when considering the buffer zones in accordance with MTAN1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity the policy will be amended to refer to circumstances where there may be a justifiable reason</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				may be reduced.	for reducing the distance.  <b>Focused Change: NF96</b>
318	Jones Bros Ruthin [2911]	POLICY MWYN6	Object	<p>The policy and justification should be simplified and revised, allowing for:</p> <p>1 Where applied, Buffer zones to be set as the minimum necessary distances, on a case-by-case basis, given other related legislative control measures.</p> <p>2 100 m buffer zones should also apply to extraction from hard rock mineral working deposits where no blasting is permitted, as MTAN1.</p> <p>3 Extensions to mineral working operations, including working of mineral-working deposits, within defined buffer zones may be permitted in exceptional cases where it is shown that there would be no unacceptable impact on existing sensitive development.</p> <p>4 Review and clarify the LDP map annotation.</p> <p>Detailed replacement policies provided (see attachment)</p>	<p><b>Partly agree</b> – Reference within the policy could be made to circumstances where there is an element of flexibility when considering the buffer zones in accordance with MTAN1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity the policy will be amended to refer to circumstances where there may be a justifiable reason for reducing the distance.</p> <p><b>Focused Change: NF96</b></p>
602	The Coal	POLICY	Object	The final paragraph of Policy MWYN6 appears to	<b>Not accepted</b> – The representation



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Authority (Mr James Smith) [2998]	MWYN6		<p>attempt to combine the issues of land instability arising from the legacy of coal mining and the potential for prior extraction of coal to avoid resource sterilisation with buffer zones around mineral sites. These are two distinct planning issues. The Coal Authority does not consider that the reference to land instability should be included within a policy relating to buffer zones around mineral sites.</p> <p>Suggested Change The Coal Authority recommends that the last paragraph of Policy MWYN6 should be moved into a new policy</p>	<p>seems to confuse buffer zones for mineral workings and the requirement for minerals safeguarding. The explanation of policy Mwyn 6 makes it clear that the purpose of a buffer zone is to protect both mineral reserves (<i>resources with planning permission</i>) and mineral resources from development that may sterilise them, but also to ensure the environmental effects of quarrying do not adversely affect sensitive development.</p> <p>Buffer zone policies do not include for prior extraction. The issue is specifically addressed in paragraph 13 of MPPW, 'safeguarding', where it states; "...<i>areas to be safeguarded should be identified on the proposals maps (constraints map for Mon &amp; Gwynedd LDP) and policies should protect potential mineral resources from other types of permanent development which would either sterilise them or hinder extraction ..... the potential for extraction of</i></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p><i>mineral resources prior to undertaking other forms of development must be considered”.</i></p> <p>The term ‘development’ in Policy Mwyn 6 does not refer to coal extraction in areas where working would otherwise be unacceptable, rather the policy identifies other forms of development (<i>as per policy 13 of MPPW</i>) that would normally be undertaken within settlement boundaries.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1813	Gwasanaeth Cynllunio Mwynau & Gwastraff Gogledd Cymru (Dafydd Gareth	POLICY MWYN6	Object	The mineral safeguarding areas (Policy MWYN1) do not appear on the proposal map on Gwynedd Council's website nor do the sand and gravel preferred areas of search referred to in policy MWYN 3.	<b>Accepted</b> – There is a mapping error which needs to be corrected and the Preferred Areas need to be shown on the proposal map.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Jones) [2578]			<p>Inconsistency with the preferred areas of search for sand and gravel in in Policy MWYN3 and Proposals Map 1.</p> <p>Need to update the safeguarding mineral areas identified on Proposals Map 1.</p> <p>Notation for some of the constraints maps is hard to interpret, e.g. safeguarding sand and gravel where the area crosses other denotations such as 'special landscape areas'.</p> <p>Proposed Changes Need to include all preferred areas of search that have been identified for sand and gravel in Policy MWYN3 on Proposals Map 1, i.e. ensure that the following areas are marked on the proposals map as well as those that have already been included, namely; Bodychain Farm, Llanllyfni, Derwyn Fawr, Gandolbenmaen, Llecheiddior Uchaf, Gandolbenmaen. Update the mineral sites identified on Proposals Map 1 to include Nanhoron Quarry and Nant Gwrtheyrn working mineral deposits. The situation</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure accuracy Bodychain Farm, Llanllyfni, Derwyn fawr, Gandolbenmaen and Llecheiddior Uchaf, Gandolbenmaen will need to be shown on the proposal map as Preferred Areas.</p> <p>For clarity the Proposal Maps should also include the mineral working at Nanhoron and Nant Gwrtheyrn.</p> <p><b>Focused Change: NF135, NF136</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>also needs to be reviewed to include new back-up quarries (if approved), but also the practicality of including small sites such as Nant Gwrtheyrn and the submission of Prohibition Orders to recommence mining on any 'dormant' mineral site, e.g. Dorothea Quarry.</p> <p>The mineral safeguarding areas (Policy MWYN1) need to be included on the interactive map as well as all the sand and gravel preferred areas of search referred to in policy MWYN3.</p>	

#### MWYN7 – Railhead and Wharf Facilities

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
260	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN7	Object	<p>The policy should include all rail and wharf facilities related to the minerals industry (rather than just those identified on the Proposals Map) as sustainable modes of transport. Where it is justified that these facilities no longer have a commercially viable future alternative site uses will be supported.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – Designating the rail and wharf facility doesn't exclude other means of sustainable transport of minerals.</p> <p>If alternative are sought they should comply with the policies and objectives of the local development plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
435	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	POLICY MWYN7	Support	Ffestiniog Town Council also supports safeguarding the land at Rhiw for railway developments. If there was a way to develop a Conwy Valley railway line, there would be an opportunity to move waste slate from Blaenau Ffestiniog to be used as an aggregate, therefore avoiding the need to create new quarries and making these slates a new source of work and income for the town.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### MWYN8 – Exploration Works

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
261	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN8	Object	As the reasoned justification states mineral exploration works are considered permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995.	<b>Not accepted</b> - Part 22, Class B to Schedule 2 of the GPDO allows for mineral exploration outside the 28 day period specified in Class A, subject to

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Delete policy.	<p>the agreement of the mineral planning authority and a set of development criteria. Petroleum exploration and excavations in excess of 10m in depth and 12 square metres in surface area do not fall within the scope of permitted development and require planning permission. Therefore the policy should remain within the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
262	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY MWYN8	Object	<p>As the reasoned justification states mineral exploration works are considered permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development Order) 1995.</p> <p>Delete policy.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Part 22, Class B to Schedule 2 of the GPDO allows for mineral exploration outside the 28 day period specified in Class A, subject to the agreement of the mineral planning authority and a set of development criteria. Petroleum exploration and excavations in excess of 10m in depth</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>and 12 square metres in surface area do not fall within the scope of permitted development and require planning permission. Therefore the policy should remain within the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1449	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY MWYN8	Object	It would be useful to know if unconventional fracturing is within scope of this policy. If yes then some flexibility built in to this policy would be welcome such as the policy will be reviewed in light of any new evidence on the potential impacts of these types of development on the environment.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - Part 22, Class B to Schedule 2 of the GPDO allows for mineral exploration outside the 28 day period specified in Class A, subject to the agreement of the mineral planning authority and a set of development criteria. Petroleum exploration and excavations in excess of 10m in depth and 12 square metres in surface area do not fall within the scope of permitted development and require planning permission. Therefore the policy should</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>remain within the Plan.</p> <p>Unconventional fracking may be considered in the same context as petroleum exploration.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
508	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	7.5.80	Object	There is potential for such works to have an archaeological / historic environment impact which should also be considered.	<p><b>Not accepted</b> - No specific provision for archaeological recording under permitted development rights under Part 22 of the GPDO other than what could be loosely interpreted as details submitted in accordance with a notification submitted to the mineral planning authority under Class B.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

#### MWYN9 – Borrow Pits

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
263	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN9	Object	<p>Existing and proposed borrow pits can be a viable source of mineral that should be supported to ensure the sterilisation of mineral does not occur.</p> <p>Environmental benefits is a wide ranging statement and requires defining.</p> <p>Support the use of existing and proposed borrow pits where commercially viable given the temporary nature of development. Definition of the scope and extent environmental benefits.</p>	<p><b>Partly accept</b> - Further clarification is required in the explanation to the policy, regarding why environmental impacts may derive from borrow pits.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity the policy will be amended to refer to circumstances where environmental impacts may derive from borrow pits.</p> <p><b>Focused change: NF97</b></p>
1184	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah	POLICY MWYN9	Object	Horizon supports a policy on borrow pits.	<b>Not Accepted</b> - Ancillary development associated with the Wylfa Newydd

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Fox) [2919]			However, rather than seek for specific amendments to policy MWYN9, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which will be the relevant policies against which to determine its associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion of its associated development from these policies.	<p>project should not be exempt from the scope of relevant policies and objectives of the LDP. Other policies within the Plan can be appropriately used to assess developments associated with Wylfa Newydd.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### MWYN10 – Restoration and After Care

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
i	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY MWYN10	Object	Restoration should explore different uses of the site alongside traditional restoration plans of returning the site to greenfield status particularly where the landform has changed significantly from its original	<b>Do not accept</b> - Alternative restoration plans may include for amenity & biodiversity interests but the comment is vague with respect to any proposed

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				form.	<p>uses. Any afteruse proposals must comply with the policies and objectives of the local development plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
265	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY MWYN10	Object	Restoration should explore different uses of the site alongside traditional restoration plans of returning the site to greenfield status particularly where the landform has changed significantly from its original form. Allow scope and flexibility in the policy for alternative and viable end uses of mineral sites where appropriate.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Alternative restoration plans may include for amenity &amp; biodiversity interests but the comment is vague with respect to any proposed uses. Any afteruse proposals must comply with the policies and objectives of the local development plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
315	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	POLICY MWYN10	Object	<p>There should be encouragement for secondary or restoration uses of mineral working sites. Restoration offers significant opportunities for recreational, economic and employment uses that can bring long lasting local benefits after restoration.</p> <p>The policy wording and the accompanying text requires to be adjusted to encourage alternative uses to be promoted.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - Alternative restoration plans may include for amenity &amp; biodiversity interests but the comment is vague with respect to any proposed uses. Any afteruse proposals must comply with the policies and objectives of the local development plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
352	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY MWYN10	Object	<p>As a way of facilitating the implementation of other policies e.g. PS16 (point 5) and AMG 5, greater emphasis and priority should be given to the potential for natural recolonisation and enhancing or providing wildlife habitats</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – It is believed that criterion 8 of Policy MWYN10 sufficiently deals with the potential for natural recolonisation and enhancing or providing wildlife habitats</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
509	Gwynedd Archaeological Planning Service (Mr Ashley Batten) [2959]	POLICY MWYN10	Object	There needs to be some recognition that quarry tips themselves are often of historic importance and restoration may not be appropriate or may at least need to be considered in this context.	<b>Not Accepted</b> – The Plan should be read as a whole, other policies within the Plan, include those which refer to landscapes of historic importance will have to be taken into consideration.  <b>Recommendation</b>  No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
592	The Coal Authority (Mr James Smith) [2998]	POLICY MWYN10	Support	The policy places a strong emphasis in achieving high standards of restoration and aftercare which the Coal Authority strongly supports. This will ensure that sites can be put to appropriate beneficial after use without future public safety issues arising from legacy.	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
381	Ellesmere Sand &	7.5.82	Object	There should be encouragement for secondary or	<b>Partly accept</b> - Any afteruse proposals

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Gravel Company Limited [2686]			restoration uses of mineral working sites. Restoration offers significant opportunities for recreational, economic and employment uses that can bring long lasting local benefits after restoration.	<p>must comply with the policies and objectives of the local development plan.</p> <p>However it is accepted that greater emphasis should be included within the Plan to, economic, recreational and environmental benefits which may arise from the development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity the policy will be amended to refer to economic, recreational and environmental benefits which may arise from the development.</p> <p><b>Focused Change: NF98</b></p>

## CHAPTER 8 & APPENDICES

### Chapter 8 - Monitoring and Implementation

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer response and recommendation
361	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	8.1	Object	With reference to theme 5 we suggest further indicators are included to enable the impact of the Plan to be fully and accurately assessed. The trigger levels should also be adjusted to reflect the fact that NRW do not object on matters affecting locally important habitats or species.	<p><b>Accept</b> – Include an additional indicator to refer to LNR and Wildlife Sites as well as LBAP habitats.. Additionally remove reference to NRW where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend Theme 5 as referred to above.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF110</b></p>
1065	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	8.3	Object	<p>Further consideration should be given to the following areas of the framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the phasing of the development sites, their delivery, relevant triggers and associated action points.</li> <li>* targets and triggers should be included to ensure that key factors are delivered.</li> <li>* arrange the chart to ensure that the WG core output indicators relate to the local output indicator.</li> <li>* where appropriate, amend core indicators to reflect local circumstances.</li> <li>* Consider the implications of the recently published</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accept</b> – it is agreed that the framework should be improved to include relevant sustainable development indicators and core indicators set out in the LDP Manual.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the framework as referred to above.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF99, NF102, NF104</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer response and recommendation
				Sustainable Development Indicators to be collected from April 2013 onwards and the ongoing LDP Process Refinement Exercise should be considered	– <b>NF110</b>
1064	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	8.5	Object	It is unclear why the authority has decided to have two separate monitoring frameworks (para 8.5).	<p><b>Accept</b> – it is agreed that the section would benefit from minor re-drafting to clarify matters.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend introductory text in accordance with the above.</p> <p><b>Focused change NF100</b></p>
479	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	8.8	Object	Theme 4 Indicator D26 Policy Target states: The rate of development does not exceed the 2,604 units in the 2011 to 2018 period. This appears to be a phasing policy which is not clearly stated in the policy sections of the document. We have objected to this elsewhere in our comments ID:130. Remove the split housing target which is effectively a phasing requirement.	<p><b>Partly accept</b> – having considered the matter Theme 4 would benefit from a clearer reference to the need to deliver a 5 year land supply and the sustainable development indicators and core indicators.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend text in accordance with the above.</p> <p><b>Focused change NF109</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer response and recommendation
847	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	8.8	Object	<p>I agree with the monitoring indicators for public transport (D4, D6,D7) however I disagree with the indicator D5 for a decrease on car journey times. Why is one of the indicators a decrease in journey times? The faster cars travel the more fuel they use and the more dangerous the journey. Also increases the likelihood of people using cars rather than buses. Also an indicator should be the public transport network is retained as it is or increased the number of buses has not declines, but increased. The times available for bus services are e.g. early morning and late buses enhanced.</p>	<p><b>Partly accept</b> – amend to refer to facilitating more sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend text in accordance with the above.</p> <p><b>Focussed change NF103, NF104</b></p>

Appendices

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
478	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	Schedule of Key Documents	Object	<p>The assessment of Candidate Site submission ref: SP870 appears to have been undertaken in isolation from that of closely related Candidate Site submission ref: SP552 (copies attached). The address should be the same (Welsh Highland Railway Ltd. trading as Welsh Highland Heritage Railway) and the proposed use also better described as tourism. Access would be through that site, not independently of it. Should not the policy approach '... judging ... against the policy/criteria ... in the adopted development plan.' also be similar?</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>Whilst consideration has been given to these two sites together, given that they were submitted as separate sites, the sites have been divided as such. Accept that there is a link between the two sites, however it is considered that only site SP552 is appropriate to be included within the Porthmadog development boundary.</p> <p>It is noted that Policy TWR1 is relevant in this instance. Whilst priority is given to developing visitor attractions and facilities within development boundaries, it does not prohibit development outside development boundaries when that is relevant.</p> <p>It is noted that site SP870 is a long and narrow linear extension into the countryside and as such it is believed that its inclusion within the development boundary would be inappropriate,</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>especially when considering the implications in relation to other JLDP policies, such as the housing policies.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
474	Mr Geraint Evans [2962]	Schedule of Settlements	Support	<p>Re: Botwnnog - Field SP433: Agree with this potential site. Central to the village, direct access from the site either to the B4413 highway or to a quieter road before joining the B4413. A footpath already exists from this site all the way to the village centre and to both schools. Botwnnog is an ideal village to develop as there are so many facilities e.g. a primary and secondary school, a surgery, a shop, a cafe, a church and a chapel.</p>	<p><b>Note comment</b> – This is housing allocation T61.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
676	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Schedule of Protected Sites or Areas	Object	<p>Apart from in Appendix 7, there is no reference to the Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest and little to the Heritage Coast, both of particular importance to protecting the heritage of Western Llŷn.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> –</p> <p>Registered Historic Landscapes are considered in Policy AT1. It is noted that the Heritage Coast is considered in Policy</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>The Heritage Coast and Landscapes of Outstanding Historical Interest should receive more mention.</p>	<p>AMG 3. It is noted that the Registered Historic Landscapes and the Heritage Coast are shown on the constraints map in relation to the Joint LDP.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
363	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	Schedule of Proposed Supplementary Planning Guidance	Support	<p>We support the inclusion of the SPG on Biodiversity but ask for clarification as to whether the Gwynedd SPG has been formally adopted by the Council. We note the proposal to revise, update and extend the SPG within 18 months of the Plans adoption</p>	<p><b>Note comment –</b></p> <p>The Supplementary Planning Guidances that are related to the Gwynedd UDP have been adopted by Gwynedd Council. This includes the SPG in relation to ‘Wildlife Sites’.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
610	Mr Paul Madden [3032]	Schedule of Proposed Supplementary Planning Guidance	Object	<p>Appendix 9 inadequately describes the existing SPGs which are currently in force and which in light of the new plan will need revising. A full list would allow responders to refer to the SPGs to understand the implications of the plan on their contents.</p> <p>Unclear if reference is made to the current SPG on Onshore Wind Energy which was subject to extensive consultation and comments in 2013. Its content should of have been acknowledged as feeding into the formulation of policy ADN1. Need a full list of current SPGs and whether they are to be revised or be replaced.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>The Supplementary Planning Guidance list noted in Appendix 9 refers to the proposed new guidance that will be prepared to support the Joint LDP policies. The currently adopted Guidance will therefore not be relevant in relation to this Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that the ‘Locating stand-alone renewable energy development’ SPG will be relevant for on shore wind energy developments. It will provide information to support Policy ADN1. In relation to this SPG, it is noted in Appendix 9 that “current adopted SPG (Gwynedd and Anglesey) will be revised and updated within 18 months of the Plan’s adoption”.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					No change

General comments

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
563	Mr John E. Williams [3013]	General Comments	Object	<p>In its present form the representation procedure is not accessible to a large number of Anglesey and Gwynedd residents. Some have neither the means or ability to access the form on line and the form when accessed does not communicate at a level which they can comprehend. The form may well be acceptable to planning departments and energy companies but represents 'official speak' which the average person does not subscribe to. In that it need to fulfil a function as a consultation document it availability and the way it is laid out must be far more user friendly.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>The internet is a way to enable a vast amount of people to see the Plan, accept however that not everybody has access to it. Paper copies of the Deposit Plan were available to see in libraries and Council Offices during the consultation period. Information regarding the key stages within the Plan’s preparation was advertised in relevant newspapers. Also, for instance, everybody that have shown an interest in the Plan are notified and updated at key stages through e-mail or letter.</p> <p>An attempt was made to make the Deposit Plan and the relevant connected documents as easy as possible to follow in terms of their language and the way that they have been set out.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
570	Angela Williams [3016]	General Comments	Object	<p>The Plan is only available online and this is discriminatory. The important issue of tourism is omitted.</p> <p>Changes: i) Information pack to every household by post ii) Application forms to be available at post offices iii) Freepost option iv) Potential adverse effects of having multiple wind turbines in 'tourist' areas must be included as a valid planning consideration.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>Paper copies of all documents relating to the Joint LDP are available, including therefore the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>Documents are available in libraries and Council Offices.</p> <p>The level of resources makes it difficult to directly contact everybody within the Plan area. It is believed that every effort has been made to publicize the relevant stages within the Plan making process and the associated documents in a way that is as effective as possible.</p> <p>Accept that alternative advertising and consultation methods could be considered in the future.</p> <p>No robust evidence has been published</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>which shows significant impact on tourism in an area due to the effect of wind turbines. A publication is available on the Welsh Government's website which refers to 'The Economic Impact of Wind Farms on Tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that there was limited evidence that wind farms impacted tourism in Wales.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
595	Age Cymru Gwynedd a Mon (Stephen Williams) [3030]	General Comments	Object	We urge both Council's to ensure that due consideration is made to the commitment agreed in the Dublin Declaration and support the overarching aims identified in the Ageing Well in Wales programme when considering future planning and developmental policies in Anglesey and Gwynedd.	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>Note the comment. It is believed that the Plan considers and satisfies the needs of older people effectively.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
597	The Coal Authority (Mr James Smith) [2998]	General Comments	Object	<p>The Coal Authority has reviewed the available documents and has identified a number of matters it would wish to see addressed.</p> <p>Suggested Changes</p> <p>Full consideration should be given to areas of planning policy interest to the Coal Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· the safeguarding of coal in accordance with the advice contained in Minerals Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales;</li> <li>· the establishment of a suitable policy framework for energy minerals including hydrocarbons in accordance with the advice</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b> The sections relating to minerals within the Plan reflect the current policy guidance within Chapter 14 of Planning Policy Wales (2016) along with MTAN2. It isn't appropriate for the Plan to repeat national policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>contained in Minerals Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduces the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales.</li> </ul>	<b>No Change</b>
665	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	General Comments	Object	<p>Agricultural Sheds Summary - an explicit policy is required regarding agricultural sheds comparable to GUDP D9. Farmers need these, but they are large structures being built in increasing numbers in rural areas. Presently planning scrutiny of shed applications appears weak and more attention needs to be given to the siting, colouring and type of materials used.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>Permitted development is applicable to a number of agricultural buildings. If planning permission is required for an agricultural shed, relevant information can be seen in Planning Policy Wales and Technical Advice Note 6 (especially part 6).</p> <p>Policy PCYFF2 is relevant when considering the visual impact of agricultural sheds.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
748	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	General Comments	Object	<p>Health Impact Assessment - this document fails to mention the potential main impact to health in the area which is the building of a new nuclear power station. The risk is not just to the current communities but the future population of the area. I would like to contest to the completeness of this document because it does not include the possible impact of a nuclear disaster at the power station and during transport of radioactive waste.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> - As the introduction section to the strategic policy on proposals for large infrastructure projects points out the development consent orders for development such as the new nuclear power station would be dealt with outside the Local Development Plan process.</p> <p>Matters in relation to health issues with such a project will be one of the issues the Planning inspectorate will consider as part of its examination of the proposal.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No Change</b>
756	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	General Comments	Object	<p>Housing: there should be more housing that is part of a housing association. The policies should emphasize the requirement for social and mixed housing. All housing developments should include a proportion of social housing i.e. houses that belong to housing associations.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>The important role that Housing Associations have in providing houses to meet specific local needs, is supported.</p> <p>Policy TA19 provides the thresholds for providing affordable housing, including a pro rata payment where providing an affordable unit is not possible. It is important that the type of housing provided meets the identified needs, including therefore for social and intermediate housing.</p> <p>Whilst it is important to provide the appropriate mix of housing, this is dependent upon specific circumstances. It cannot be insisted that a Housing Association is part of every housing development. It is also likely that there would be financial implications for housing associations in terms of this.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
910	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	General Comments	Object	<p>We find the JLDP draft less well structured, less concise and less coherent than the current GUDP in respect of presentation, emphasis and prioritisation of policies. Provide link to GUDP, including analysis of GUDP performance, reasons for changes in approach and emphasis. Provide additional, more specific but more concise policies for each type of planning development on model of GUDP. Improve style and presentation, proof check punctuation and grammar. Exclude jargon. Simplify language. Matrix relating relevant JLDP policies to each type of planning proposal.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>The Joint LDP will not include a policy for every type of development. Neither will it repeat national policy guidance.</p> <p>It is not possible for the Plan to consider all types of development. A list of all the policies is noted in Appendix 8.</p> <p>Whilst some technical terms have to be used, it is noted that Deposit Plan and associated documents attempt a simple style as often as possible. It is noted that the Plan will be proof read.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
971	Cyngor Cymuned Llanrug. (Mr Meirion Jones) [3134]	General Comments	Support	<p>Llanrug Community Council is satisfied with the Plan.</p>	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<b>No change</b>
1822	Mr Thomas Conway [3371]	General Comments	Object	<p>The Deposit Plan is too large, impracticable and fragmented for public consultation. All the information for Anglesey and Gwynedd has been combined meaning the documents are extremely log. Both counties are different with different needs and need different policies to suit them. There is a lack of cross referencing within the documents and a representation form that is not fit for purpose. A 6 week consultation period is grossly inadequate, whilst available in libraries they are not open all of the time.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted –</b></p> <p>It is noted that the method of preparing the Plan corresponds with the relevant regulations. It is very important that the Plan’s content is based upon extensive and comprehensive evidence.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>



**SUB-REGIONAL CENTRE**

**1) Bangor**

<b>Rep ID</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan</b>	<b>Comments and Recommendations</b>
1552	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T1 - Goetra Uchaf, Bangor	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
113	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	POLICY TAI14, T2 - Former Friars School Playing Field, Bangor	Object	Abolish plans to develop 1) the old Friars site on Ffriddoedd Road 2) the Pen y Ffridd site 3) check that there are no plans to develop the area between Ffordd Eithinog and Bryn Eithinog - build on brownfield and not greenfield	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026. Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1419	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	POLICY TAI14, T2 - Former Friars School Playing Field, Bangor	Object	<p>I would like to see the justification for proposing the former Friars site - where did this appear and what justification is there for building on this site? It is a mistake to build more houses without carefully considering the infrastructure and amenities and there needs to be planning to ensure that amenities and infrastructure plans are an integral part of any plans for more housing. I would like to see us collecting our own data, basing our need for housing on data rather than on the Welsh Government's figures.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026. Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1553	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T2 - Former Friars School Playing Field, Bangor	Object	<p>* This site may be at a height where mains water cannot be guaranteed at all times. Under the Water Industry Act 1991, DCWW are not obliged to provide mains water to a height greater than that it will flow by gravity from the service reservoir or tank the supply is taken. As such it is likely that a hydraulic modelling assessment will be required to establish if improvements are required to the water network to supply water to this site. Any requirement to upgrade our water network can be acquired through the water requisition provisions of the Water</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Industry.	
1554	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T2 - Former Friars School Playing Field, Bangor	Object	<p>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
671	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TAI14, T3 - Former Jewsons Site, Bangor	Support	T3 is a small redevelopment site which has been empty for some time. T3 is broadly acceptable to us.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1556	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T3 - Former Jewsons Site, Bangor	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* The site would eventually drain to the Bangor Beach Road SPS and an assessment of this SPS may be required to establish whether flows from this site can be accommodated or whether future improvements would be required to the SPS to allow development to proceed.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
104	Natural Resources Wales (Mr Gareth	POLICY TAI14, T4 - Former Crosville Site,	Object	The housing allocation T4 is within flood zone C2 of Welsh Government's TAN15:	<p><b>Accepted</b> Gwynedd Consultancy was commissioned</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Thomas) [2757]	Bangor		<p>Development Advice Maps. TAN15 confirms highly vulnerable developments should not be located within such areas. A Strategic Flood Consequences Assessment has been completed, but this site was not included within any such assessment. The SFCA, section 9.3 states that none of the allocations fall within zones C1 or C2.</p> <p>Separate Call-In procedures exist where more than 10 dwellings located within zone C2 would need to be called in by the Local Planning Authority to the Welsh Government for direction. The flood risk has not been assessed.</p> <p>Remove allocation T4 from the Joint Local Development Plan, with possible substitution with a suitable alternative sites outside of flood zones C1 and C2</p>	<p>to undertake a stage 2 SFCA which shows that the site does not comply with the requirements of TAN15.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The allocation should be removed from the plan and a suitable alternative found in its place in order to ensure internal consistency of the plan and to conform to National Policy Guidance.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF112, NF77</b></p>
672	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TAI14, T4 - Former Crosville Site, Bangor	Object	T4 is a small redevelopment site which has been empty for some time. T4 would seem vulnerable to flooding and therefore inappropriate for housing.	
1084	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY TAI14, T4 - Former Crosville Site, Bangor	Object	The land is located with flood zone C2 of the Welsh Government's TAN15: Development Advice Maps. Developing this land for residential use would contradict national policy guidance contained within TAN15. NRW recommends that either a stage 2 or stage 3 SFCA is prepared and forwarded to NRW for further assessment to demonstrate that developing this site for	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				residential use would comply with the requirements of TAN15 or that this allocation is removed from the Local Development Plan.	
1555	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T4 - Former Crosville Site, Bangor	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* The site would eventually drain to the Bangor Beach Road SPS and an assessment of this SPS may be required to establish whether flows from this site can be accommodated or whether future improvements would be required to the SPS to allow development to proceed.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
669	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TAI14, T5 - Land opposite The Crematorium, Bangor	Support	The proposed sites in Bangor include a green field site (T5) opposite the crematorium, adjacent to the development boundary and within the SLA; this has good access and may not be convenient for agricultural use as it is separated from other fields. T5 is broadly acceptable to us.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1293	RCH Douglas Pennant [3070]	POLICY TAI14, T5 - Land opposite The Crematorium, Bangor	Support	<p>The proposed allocation of circa 72 residential units on T5 is supported for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deliverability - Positive Planning</li> <li>- Allocated Housing Numbers</li> <li>- Development Principle</li> </ul>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Opportunities and constraints - App 1</li> <li>- Indicative Masterplan - App 2</li> <li>- Positive Sustainability Appraisal</li> </ul>	
1299 & 1345	Cyngor Dinas Bangor (Mr Gwyn Hughes) [1523]	POLICY TAI14, T5 - Land opposite The Crematorium, Bangor	Object	<p>The City Council are of the opinion that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site is located in a prominent and attractive rural location, divorced from the built up area of the City of Bangor and the shopping, community facilities and services it provides. It would therefore not be sustainable development as it would encourage the use of motor cars in order to take advantage of these facilities.</li> <li>- It would extend a ribbon development into an attractive rural landscape to the detriment of the character and visual amenities of the area.</li> <li>- The site occupies a prominent location when viewed from the adjoining highway and buildings erected thereon would dominate the skyline and cause serious injury to the visual amenities of the area.</li> <li>- The residential allocation of the site should be re-considered and the development boundary re-drawn to exclude the site.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026. Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1557	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T5 - Land opposite The Crematorium, Bangor	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
912 & 915	Dr Dewi Roberts [3096]	Map 1 - Bangor	Object	<p>The Proposals Map for Bangor excludes the property Derwen Deg from the settlement boundary together with other properties fronting to Hwfa Road. The Plan should be modified to include these existing properties within the Settlement Boundary. Derwen Deg is a long established property, built 18??, that formed an important part of the original expansion of the city in the late Victorian period and the development of the</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Development boundaries are drawn around the urban form of settlements. The properties along Ffordd Hwfa and Derwen Deg are considered to be part of Bangor's urban form.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure the internal consistency of the plan the development boundary should be amended to include both the properties on</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				University. The Conservation Area boundary includes the property and recognizes its importance as part of the built environment. The land use shown on that plan clearly shows the house and its curtilage as part of the existing housing whilst the surrounding oak woodland and green spaces that provide the setting for the built environment are rightly protected.	Ffordd Hwfa and Derwen Deg.  <b>Focussed Change NF113</b>
913	Catrin Eames [3097]	Map 1 - Bangor	Object	<p>We wish to propose a site off Siliwen Road to be included in the development boundary of Bangor. The site is identified as being located immediately adjoining the development boundary in 3 directions. It is considered that the continuation of the development boundary as shown on the attached plan would form a logical and reasonable extension to the development boundary of Bangor. The site is well integrated with and connected to the existing pattern of development along Siliwen Road. The site would sensitively infill a small gap between existing housing.</p> <p>We wish to seek that the development boundary of Bangor be extended to include the land off Siliwen Road as shown on the attached plan which will form a logical and reasonable extension to the development boundary.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Development boundaries are drawn around the urban form of settlements. The site in question is not considered to be part of the Bangor's urban form.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1020	Mr Bleddyn Hughes [68]	Map 1 - Bangor	Object	Site SP270 as amended is a natural infill and would be in line with existing	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>dwelling already included within the Deposit Plan boundary and is a natural extension to the settlement. The development of this site answers all the criteria listed within the SA Framework offering housing to local people who work local. It takes account of the relevant community strategy. It is poor agricultural land which would lend itself to housing and would not unduly encroach into open countryside. The alleged traffic issues in Penrhosgarnedd are not insurmountable.</p> <p>We wish the Deposit Plan boundary to include site SP270 as amended.</p>	<p>new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1022	Mr R Ellerby [3185]	Map 1 - Bangor	Object	<p>The plan fails to provide for sufficient housing in the sub regional centre of Bangor to meet its target growth level of 969 dwelling units. This site would help to address this deficit and its sustainable well screened location would form a logical extension to the urban form of the</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>settlement.</p> <p>Redrafting of the development boundary for Bangor indicated on Inset Map 1 to include this site and its designation as a housing allocation without planning permission.</p>	<p>include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the LDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1416	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	Map 1 - Bangor	Object	<p>I would like to verify that the identified area on Ffordd Eithinog does not include the drover's road between Bryn Eithinog and Ffordd Eithinog. In addition, with regards to specific sites, I would like to see Pen y Ffridd be deleted entirely.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b> In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1302	Cyngor Dinas Bangor (Mr Gwyn Hughes) [1523]	Map 1 – Bangor	Object	Identify Pen y Bryn Gardens and Penrhyn Arms as protected open Space	<p><b>Accepted</b> Established open space with recreational value</p>
1383	Bangor Civic Society (Mr Don Mathew) [2988]				<p><b>Recommendation</b> Identify as protected open space on Inset Map</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF114</b></p>

**URBAN SERVICE CENTRE**

**2) Amlwch**

<b>Rep ID</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan</b>	<b>Comments and Recommendations</b>
687	Cyngor Tref Amlwch (Mrs M Hughes) [1266]	POLICY TAI14, T6 - Land near Maes Mona, Amlwch	Support	At least 10% should be starter homes for young local people - our youngsters are leaving the area due to the lack of employment. Population is important to Amlwch.	<b>Note the Support</b> Policy TAI9 aims to secure an appropriate level of affordable housing in the Plan area  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1558	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T6 - Land near Maes Mona, Amlwch	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site. * Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed development sites/growth figure.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
689	Cyngor Tref Amlwch (Mrs M Hughes) [1266]	POLICY TAI14, T7 - Land near Lôn Bach, Amlwch	Support	At least 10% should be starter homes for young local people - our youngsters are leaving the area due to the lack of employment. Population is important to Amlwch	<b>Note the Support</b> Policy TAI9 aims to secure an appropriate level of affordable housing in the Plan area  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1559	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T7 - Land near Lôn Bach, Amlwch	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site. Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by a sewer and protection	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site. * Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from these proposed development sites/growth figure.	
691	Cyngor Tref Amlwch (Mrs M Hughes) [1266]	POLICY TAI14, T8 - Land at Madryn Farm, Amlwch	Support	At least 10% should be starter homes for young local people - our youngsters are leaving the area due to the lack of employment. Population is important to Amlwch.	<b>Note the Support</b> Policy TAI9 aims to secure an appropriate level of affordable housing in the Plan area.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1560	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T8 - Land at Madryn Farm, Amlwch	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site. Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by a sewer and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site. * Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from these proposed development sites/growth figure.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
693	Cyngor Tref Amlwch (Mrs M Hughes) [1266]	POLICY TAI14, T9 - Land near Rheinwas Field, Amlwch	Support	At least 10% should be starter homes for young local people - our youngsters are leaving the area due to the lack of employment. Population is important to	<b>Note the Support</b> Policy TAI9 aims to secure an appropriate level of affordable housing in the Plan area.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Amlwch.	<b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1561	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T9 - Land near Rheinwas Field, Amlwch	Support	<p>* Off-site water mains may be required to serve the site. These can be provided through a water requisition scheme under Sections 41 - 44 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>* Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from these proposed development sites/growth figure.</p>	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
685	Cyngor Tref Amlwch (Mrs M Hughes) [1266]	POLICY TAI14, T10 - Land near Tan y Bryn Amlwch	Object	<p>Concern with this site as there is a problem with surface water.</p> <p>The Council feel that if these building areas become reality, that at least 10% should be starter homes for young local people - our youngsters are leaving the area due to lack of employment. Population is important to Amlwch.</p>	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026. Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be
1377	Mr Chris Jones [1683]	POLICY TAI14, T10 - Land near Tan y Bryn Amlwch	Object	<p>Candidate site T10 includes land owned by the applicants for which permission is refused. Development on site may deny legal rights of access to site by occupier of Tan y Bryn.</p> <p>Removal of T10 from development plan.</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1562	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T10 - Land near Tan y Bryn Amlwch	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</li> <li>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</li> <li>* Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from these proposed development sites/growth figure.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
931	Mr Hugh Rowlands [3115]	Map 2 - Amlwch	Object	The site is in perfect location for development especially with the inclusion of site SP561. It would enhance all	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>aspects of Amlwch and remove the current eyesore that effects Amlwch and the future development of SP561 (who wants to buy a house next to a site for fly tipping!). It would provide much needed affordable housing, with the minimum transport infrastructure development costs and disturbance to the residents. Any infrastructure development required for drainage works would only reduce the potential of flood risk not only to the site but also the rest of Amlwch. The site should be included within the development for housing to help meet the settlements needs.</p>	<p>Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p>Site was filtered from the Candidate Site process at the 1<sup>st</sup> stage as the majority of the site falls within a C2 flood risk zone. No evidence to the contrary has been provided by the respondent.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1201	Dafydd Ioan Hughes [2083]	Map 2 - Amlwch	Object	The reason for my objection is as follows in that from a consistency basis the Rhos	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Place development is an ideal "alternative site" to maximise the land footprint available as part of the Deposit plan. Amlwch has been designated as a primary growth area as part of the overall development plan and this particular site lends itself to mirror the SP561 development and allow for an infilling development which would enhance both the landscape, infrastructure and provide a much needed mixture of housing development right in the middle of Amlwch. Access to the highway and amenities are all walking distance and the Sustainability Matrix addresses the 11 key points.</p> <p>There appears also to be planning history on this particular site in that in January 1978 Anglesey Borough Council granted themselves deemed permission as housing authority in respect of this particular site reaffirming the land's suitability for residential development.</p>	<p>new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p>Site was filtered from the Candidate Site process at the 1<sup>st</sup> stage as the majority of the site falls within a C2 flood risk zone. No evidence to the contrary has been provided by the respondent.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1395	Mr Lloyd Williams	Map 2 - Amlwch	Object	My client has a plot of development land	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2838]			<p>adjacent to a JLDP considered site in Amwlch (T10). We believe that including this site would improve the housing policy TAI14.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Within walking distance to community facilities</li> <li>- All main services present</li> <li>- Land available for development during plan period</li> <li>- Low visual and landscape impact</li> </ul>	<p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan’s policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p>Issues raised during the Candidate Site Assessment processed highlighted the inadequate visibility at the junction with the A5025 and capacity of Lôn Bach.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the LDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 3) Holyhead

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1563	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T11 - Tyddyn Bach, Holyhead	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
387 & 402	Mr Dave Eccles [269]	POLICY TAI14, T12 - Land near Cae Rhos, Holyhead	Object	<p>The AONB, SAC and SPA will all be adversely affected by the proximity and the amount of additional proposed housing developments.</p> <p>Fluvial flooding associated with standing water. Poorly drained land will place significant constraints on development. Bedrock at shallow depth will present constraints on the construction and design of the sites drainage. Bedrock near the surface limits the fall on drainage runs and the options for surface water management and disposal. Alternative brownfield sites with the advantages of services access, no flooding, and green space for amenities are in close proximity. Two large windfall sites resulting from 2 agreed school closures. That the land at Cae Rhos not be considered as a site designated for housing or other development.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026. Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
660	Mr TA Nevin [244]	POLICY TAI14, T12 - Land near Cae Rhos, Holyhead	Support	The site T12 will meet with all the relevant issues raised by any / all council. Departments to support a housing development.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1564	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T12 - Land near Cae Rhos, Holyhead	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1565	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T12 - Land near Cae Rhos, Holyhead	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	<b>No Change</b>
1566	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T12 - Land near Cae Rhos, Holyhead	Object	* Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from these proposed development sites/growth figure.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
389	Mr Dave Eccles [269]	POLICY TAI14, T13 - Land near Yr Ogof, Holyhead	Object	The AONB, SAC and SPA will all be adversely affected by the proximity and the amount of additional proposed housing developments. Pluvial flooding associated with standing water. Poorly drained land will place significant constraints on development. Bedrock at shallow depth will present constraints on the construction and design of the sites drainage. Bedrock near the surface limits the fall on drainage runs and the options for surface water management and disposal. Alternative brownfield sites with the advantages of services access, no flooding, and green	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026. Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				space for amenities are in close proximity. Two large windfall sites resulting from 2 agreed school closures. That the land at Yr Ogof not be considered as a site designated for housing or other development.	<p>suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1567	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TA114, T13 - Land near Yr Ogof, Holyhead	Object	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1568	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T13 - Land near Yr Ogof, Holyhead	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1569	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T13 - Land near Yr Ogof, Holyhead	Object	* Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from these proposed development sites/growth figure	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1570	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T14 - Land near Tyddyn Bach Farm, Holyhead	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1571	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T14 - Land near Tyddyn Bach Farm, Holyhead	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat,	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	<b>No Change</b>
1572	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T14 - Land near Tyddyn Bach Farm, Holyhead	Support	* Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) can accommodate the foul flows from these proposed development sites/growth figure.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1573	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T15 - Land near Waunfawr Estate, Holyhead	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1574	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T16 - Glan y Dŵr, Holyhead	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1575	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T17 - Cae Serrri Road, Holyhead	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
916	Holyhead Marina Ltd [3101]	Map 3 - Holyhead	Object	It was clearly the intention of the original plan to use the line of mean high water to define the boundary between the County of Anglesey and the Statutory Harbour	<b>Accepted</b> As with all settlements that are located on the coast, the development boundary aims to follow the line of mean high water.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Authority. This line was drafted based on an old Ordnance Survey maps. Development and land reclamation have altered the line of mean high water and therefore left a key area of land (which has been developed) between the development boundary and the harbour. This is inconsistent but disjointed permissions for development of Holyhead's waterfront on land surrounding the site. Amend the development boundary to include the land.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b> The Holyhead Marina has altered this line therefore to ensure the internal consistency of the plan the development boundary should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF116</b></p>
947	W H Edwards [2256]	Map 3 - Holyhead	Object	<p>Please include my land in the development plan. There is currently no access to the land but my neighbour has agreed that I can access the land via his field.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>housing and employment needs.</p> <p>Other sites with less access issues are available in Holyhead.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
952	Lisa Fowlie [2093]	Map 3 - Holyhead	Object	<p>I submitted some land in my ownership in Holyhead as a Candidate Site for residential use (SY287) at Llaingoch. The land is not suitable for agricultural use and is only really useful for grazing horses. It is however ideally suited for sustainable residential use.</p> <p>The land has access both vehicular and pedestrian from the existing highway network. It is served by the local bus service and is within walking distance of town centre, local shops and amenities, including primary and secondary schools. The site is on the edge of the development boundary. Technically there are means to sustainably drain surface water and the main sewer is also accessible. The site forms a natural infill between Hirfron and the higher land to the east.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1830	Conygar Stenaline Ltd [3373]	Map 3 - Holyhead	Object	<p>* Change Policy TAI14 to include the Holyhead Waterfront Site as a housing allocation that is part of a mixed-use scheme (site has extant planning consent for 380 residential units, 7,645 m<sup>2</sup> of commercial space and an 80 bed hotel). * The scheme has the potential to make a critical impact on the regeneration of Holyhead and Anglesey and to deliver the "transformational change" sought in Policy CYF7. * The development has a potentially important role in meeting the objectives of Policy TAI3 (providing key worker accommodation associated with Wylfa Newydd). * Allocation T16 'Glan y Dŵr' should be revised from 90 to 380 units to reflect the residential units approved. The commercial floorspace provision and the hotel proposal should be referenced in policies CYF1 &amp; 7 and TWR2. The development will make a significant contribution to achieving the key objectives which underpin Policies CYF1 and 7, as well as Housing Policies 1, 3 and 9.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The majority of the residential units approved are located beyond the mean high water mark and the allocation reflects</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					the units with permission on land. We do not propose to extend the housing allocation over the sea.  <b>No Change</b>

#### 4) Llangefni

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1576	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T18 - Land near Ty Hen, Llangefni	Object	* Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by a trunk water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the density achievable on site.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1577	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T18 - Land near Ty Hen, Llangefni	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	
1578	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T18 - Land near Ty Hen, Llangefni	Object	<p>* Off-site sewers required to connect to the public sewerage network can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>* Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1579	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T19 - Former Ysgol y Bont, Llangefni	Object	<p>* Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the density achievable on site.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1580	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T19 - Former Ysgol y Bont, Llangefni	Object	<p>* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	
1581	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T19 - Former Ysgol y Bont, Llangefni	Object	<p>* Off-site sewers required to connect to the public sewerage network can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991</p> <p>* Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
498	Mr B Pritchard [2951]	POLICY TAI14, T20 - Ty'n Coed, Llangefni	Object	The allocation of housing sites to the north of Llangefni represents a logical extension to the urban area, however, the proposed development boundary is drawn too restrictively and the site allocations are of insufficient size to provide the numbers of new dwellings required in the plan period. Further land is available in this location and a revised development boundary would facilitate appropriate new housing development. Specifically land identified as site SP159 on the Candidate Site register is available to cater for new housing and this would form a logical extension of the urban area.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the JLDP identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1273	Aporis Trading LLP [3151]	POLICY TAI14, T20 - Ty'n Coed, Llangefni	Object	<p>It is considered that there is an over-reliance on windfall sites within the LDP. It is not considered that there is sufficient landbank within the development boundary to accommodate the identified windfall needed within the centre of Llangefni. We wish to propose an extension to the allocated site (T20) land adjacent to Tyn Coed to be included within the development boundary for allocation of housing to ensure that the level of housing is maintained over the plan period. It is considered that the extension to the allocated site would form a logical and reasonable addition with well-defined boundaries allowing for more comprehensive and sustainable development.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the alternative site is</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.  <b>No Change</b>
1582	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T20 - Ty'n Coed, Llangefni	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1583	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T20 - Ty'n Coed, Llangefni	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1584	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T20 - Ty'n Coed, Llangefni	Object	* Off-site sewers required to connect to the public sewerage network can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. * Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				from this development area.	<b>No Change</b>
1585	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T21 - Land near Ysgol y Graig, Llangefni	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1586	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T21 - Land near Ysgol y Graig, Llangefni	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1587	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T21 - Land near Ysgol y Graig, Llangefni	Object	* Off-site sewers required to connect to the public sewerage network can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. * Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1588	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T22 - Land near Bro Tudur, Llangefni	Object	* Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by a water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the density achievable on site.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1589	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T22 - Land near Bro Tudur, Llangefni	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1590	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T22 - Land near Bro Tudur, Llangefni	Object	* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991 * Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>No Change</b>
1591	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T23 - Land near Coleg Menai, Llangefni	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1592	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T23 - Land near Coleg Menai, Llangefni	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990. A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1593	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T23 - Land near Coleg Menai, Llangefni	Object	* Off-site sewers required to connect to the public sewerage network can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. * Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1000	Watkin Jones (Mr Stuart Hardy) [3159]	Map 4 - Llangefni	Object	Land at Tan y Capel, Llangefni. The above information, which is supplemented by a comprehensive sustainability appraisal of the site, indicates that the site is suitable for housing and should be included as a candidate/allocated site within the JLDP. The site is accessible, available, deliverable and developable and can help Anglesey/Gwynedd meet its housing requirements throughout the plan period. It is therefore considered to be appropriate to be brought forward due to its central location in Llangefni, which is recognised within the JLDP as priority area for development.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1001	Watkin Jones (Mr Stuart Hardy) [3159]	Map 4 - Llangefni	Object	Land adj Fron Farm, Llangefni. The above information, which is supplemented by a comprehensive sustainability appraisal of the site, indicates that the site is suitable	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context,</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>for housing and should be included as a candidate/allocated site within the JLDP. The site is accessible, available, deliverable and developable and can help Anglesey/Gwynedd meet its housing requirements throughout the plan period. It is therefore considered to be appropriate to be brought forward due to its central location in Llangefni, which is recognised within the JLDP as a priority area for development.</p>	<p>Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Issues raised during the Candidate Site Assessment process highlighted the inadequate visibility at the junction with the B5109 and capacity of the road through the estate.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1005	Rhian Williams [2303]	Map 4 - Llangefni	Object	<p>Land at Gwernhefin, Llangefni. My wish is to see land at Gwernhefin included in the deposit plan for the reasons noted in the</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				enclosed notes.	<p>Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the alternative site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1006	Alyn Nicholls [3084]	Map 4 - Llangefni	Object	Land at Caeau Bodelis Fields should be allocated for housing development.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 5) Blaenau Ffestiniog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
420	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	POLICY TAI14, T24 - Former Playing Fields, Blaenau Ffestiniog	Object	To designate Y Ddôl, the old site of the Rugby Club, for housing. It is very important to note that this site lies on floodplain. The maps that were created by the old Environmental Agency about flood risks confirm this. Therefore, if houses are built on that site, they would have to be specially designed, perhaps	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>even raised on stilts. Building normal houses would mean forcing future residents to suffer floods time after time.</p>	<p>required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1594	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	POLICY TAI14, T24 - Former Playing Fields,	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]	Blaenau Ffestiniog		<p>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</p> <p>* Blaenau Ffestiniog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1595	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T25 - Land at Congl y Wal, Blaenau Ffestiniog	Object	<p>* Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the density achievable on site.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1596	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T25 - Land at Congl y Wal, Blaenau Ffestiniog	Object	<p>* The foul flows would lead to Tanrhos Manod Pumping Station (SPS) and an assessment of this SPS may be needed to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed. Should off-site sewers be required these can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>* Blaenau Ffestiniog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.</p>	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to have ongoing discussions with DCWW on the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1636	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C18 - Tanygrisiau Site, Blaenau Ffestiniog	Support	<p>* Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area.</p> <p>* Blaenau Ffestiniog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
979	Mrs Mair Jones [3144]	Map 5 - Blaenau Ffestiniog	Object	<p>This brownfield site relates to the urban fabric of the settlement rather than the adjoining open countryside and is well located both in terms of access to local services and facilities and public transport services. Its inclusion within the settlement boundary of Blaenau Ffestiniog would represent a logical rounding off of the settlement, where it will be well placed to help contribute towards the required indicative windfall provision of housing units. Any such contributions are important because as the Plan notes this required level of provision is a challenge to achieve due to the significant physical constraints the settlement experiences.</p> <p>Redrafting of the development boundary for Blaenau Ffestiniog indicated on Inset Map 5 to include this site.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Due to significant physical constraints in Blaenau Ffestiniog there was a difficulty of identifying suitable sites to allocate for housing. To combat this the Strategy proposes a higher level brownfield land and buildings within the settlement compared to other settlements.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site within the development boundary would: provide sufficient flexibility within the Plan to achieve the indicative windfall figure for Blaenau Ffestiniog; align with the Plan's spatial strategy; and ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Focussed Changed NF117</b></p>

## 6) Caernarfon

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations
1597	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T26 - Former Hendre School, Caernarfon	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Caernarfon Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1598	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T27 - Land to the rear of Maes Gwynedd, Caernarfon	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1599	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T27 - Land to the rear of Maes Gwynedd, Caernarfon	Object	<p>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations
				resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	
1600	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T27 - Land to the rear of Maes Gwynedd, Caernarfon	Object	* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Caernarfon Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1601	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T28 - Cae Phillips Road, Caernarfon	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
988	Watkin Jones (Mr Stuart Hardy) [3159]	Map 6 - Caernarfon	Object	To allocate Gallt y Sill/Tyddyn Pandy (SP632), Caernarfon for Residential Uses. The submission provides further information and justification as to why the site should be allocated within the Joint Local Development Plan. The site has been assessed in accordance with the Council's site assessment methodology (Topic Papers 1 & 1A), and Sustainability Appraisal methodology, set out in the Deposit SA Report. The letter and submitted assessment demonstrates that the subject site is justified, effective,	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations
				deliverable, viable and consistent with Policy, and therefore justify inclusion in the final Local Development Plan.	including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.
989	Mr George Denham [34]	Map 6 - Caernarfon	Object	Support including land adjoining Tyddyn Pandy (SP586), for housing development. The land is based within the proposed line of the new Caernarfon bypass. It is immediately adjacent to housing development T28 and would not be protruding into nearby countryside. Not enough land has been allocated for housing in Caernarfon to compare with Holyhead and smaller towns such as Llangefni and Blaenau Ffestiniog. The vast majority of land allocated within the development boundary for housing in Caernarfon is Council owned land and there are not many privately owned land. The inclusion of the said land would have a positive impact on the people, area and economy of Caernarfon.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
990	Aporis Trading LLP [3151]	Map 6 - Caernarfon	Object	It is considered that there is an over-reliance on windfall sites within the Local Development Plan. It is not considered that there is sufficient landbank within the development boundary to accommodate the identified windfall need within the centre of Caernarfon. We wish to propose a site adjacent to Glan Seiont (identified as site SP606 on the candidate site register) to be included within the development boundary of Caernarfon for allocation of housing to ensure that the level of housing is	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations
				<p>maintained over the plan period.</p> <p>We wish to seek the following changes:</p> <p>1. Additional land should be allocated within the Urban Service Centre of Caernarfon for housing to accommodate the identified housing need to ensure that the level of housing is maintained over the plan period.</p> <p>2. The site adjacent to Glan Seiont should be included within the development boundary of Caernarfon and allocated for housing.</p>	<p>including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 7) Porthmadog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations
101	Mr Bryan Rees Jones [2737]	Map 7 - Porthmadog	Object	<p>Include a plot of land, namely Moelwyn Dairy, Porthmadog Plot OS.56390101 within the Plan based on the fact that it conforms with Policies TAI10 and TAI14.</p> <p>1. The plot of land should be included within the town boundary. It conforms with the criteria of Policy TAI10 for Affordable Housing. 2. Policy TAI14 states a growth level of 123 for Porthmadog. 3. It is intended to use the plot entirely for Affordable Housing. It is land that was used to prepare and distribute milk and</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Although Porthmadog is defended against flooding, large parts of the settlement are categorised as being within flood zone C1. It is the Councils' opinion that no suitable alternative site can be found outside the flood risk area therefore it has been necessary to identify alternative locations in the settlement's catchment area to assist in meeting the requirement for housing.</p> <p>Suitable sites have been found in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	
				permission has been given for a Rescue Team Centre. 4. All public services are available	<p>Penrhyndeudraeth and Criccieth to help meet Porthmadog's housing requirement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
137	Mr Llywelyn Rhys [2770]	Map 7 - Porthmadog	Object	Include additional land to develop housing (affordable and for the market) on Moelwyn Dairy land. Map reference O.S. SH5639 and SH5539. As a great deal of the town is affected by flood risk, it is not possible to serve the projected growth level (see Topic Paper 5, Table 16, page 48). Including the plot would conform to the criteria of Policies TAI10 and TAI14. All public services are available for the site.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Although Porthmadog is defended against flooding, large parts of the settlement are categorised as being within flood zone C1. It is the Councils' opinion that no suitable alternative site can be found outside the flood risk area therefore it has been necessary to identify alternative locations in the settlement's catchment area to assist in meeting the requirement for housing.</p> <p>Suitable sites have been found in Penrhyndeudraeth and Criccieth to help meet Porthmadog's housing requirement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
274	Mr Alun Evans [2854]	Map 7 - Porthmadog	Object	I feel that the 20 acres of land I own should be included in the boundaries of what is deemed to be land that can be part of this policy i.e. Affordable Housing,	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Although Porthmadog is defended against flooding, large parts of the settlement are categorised as being within flood zone C1.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	
				<p>the land can be used to build one or two houses, the remainder of the land has much many wildlife benefits and can accordingly be developed into a nature reserve or maintained to preserve the environment. The land in question is as follows SH5637 and SH5638 Borth y Gest, Porthmadog.</p>	<p>It is the Councils' opinion that no suitable alternative site can be found outside the flood risk area therefore it has been necessary to identify alternative locations in the settlement's catchment area to assist in meeting the requirement for housing.</p> <p>Suitable sites have been found in Penrhyndeudraeth and Criccieth to help meet Porthmadog's housing requirement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
295	Mrs Elen Williams [2874]	Map 7 - Porthmadog	Object	<p>The current development plan outline for Porthmadog is limited to the town centre, and as it stands it will not sufficiently meet the housing shortage problem in the town. This is mainly due to insufficient land within the LDP outline to build new housing. Housing shortages in the town are regularly reported in the local press and therefore other suitable sustainable options and locations need to be considered. In its current state the LDP boundary for Porthmadog is not future proof, and doesn't allow for flexibility to meet potential future housing demands. Amend the development boundary to include Cae Brics near Maes Gerddi.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Although Porthmadog is defended against flooding, large parts of the settlement are categorised as being within flood zone C1. It is the Councils' opinion that no suitable alternative site can be found outside the flood risk area therefore it has been necessary to identify alternative locations in the settlement's catchment area to assist in meeting the requirement for housing.</p> <p>Suitable sites have been found in Penrhyndeudraeth and Criccieth to help meet Porthmadog's housing requirement.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	
					would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
376	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	MAP 7 - Porthmadog	Object	The Company considers that the area covered should a) be shown on the Proposals Map (as indicated in the policy), and b) be extended to include all of the land covered by Candidate Site submission ref: SP870 and surrounding area, including open land on both sides of the new A487(T) bypass road (copies of this submission and earlier related Candidate Site submission ref: SP552 attached).	<b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing and employment land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.  <b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>
975	Arwel Williams [3139]	Map 7 - Porthmadog	Object	Our concerns reference Bryn Awel, Hill, Street, Porthmadog LL49 9BD, and at present the development boundary doesn't reflect the established use of the land which forms part of the garden at Bryn Awel. As on the Land Registry copy of the plan (CYM78816), the property's boundary has changed. The extension of the property's land may provide opportunity in the future for new development e.g. a granny flat. The land is accessible and full amenities are available. Amend the development boundary so that it reflects the new boundary of Bryn Awel (see attached map)	<b>Not Accepted</b> Development boundaries are drawn around the built up form of settlements and where possible follow physical features on the ground and not land ownership.  <b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	
				Include the site shown within the development boundary.	
976	Mrs Pamela Beer [266]	Map 7 - Porthmadog	Object	<p>Development boundary near Penbryn Cottage has been shown incorrectly. The line on the Proposal Map does not follow the boundary of the property and it excludes the garden area to the north and south. The area to the south has always been part of the back garden of Penybryn Cottage and the area to the north is a parking area for the property. I believe the development boundary should be redrawn to include the whole of the cottage grounds (see attached plans). I have copies of the old O.S. Maps if required to support the above together with aerial photographs.</p> <p>Redraw Development Boundary as per submitted plans for the reasons explained in 2c.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Development boundaries are drawn around the built up form of settlements and where possible follow physical features on the ground and not land ownership.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1044	Mrs Haf Madoc Wilson [263]	Map 7 - Porthmadog	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land is outside flood risk</li> <li>2. Within walking distance of schools, workplaces and public services such as libraries, food shop businesses, 'blue lights' stations.</li> <li>3. There are already many houses nearby.</li> <li>4. The need for affordable housing to keep young people (Welsh speaking) in the area.</li> </ol> <p>I would like to see the boundaries of Porthmadog extended to include land at Penclogwyn in case the town loses its new settlement building rights to</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Although Porthmadog is defended against flooding, large parts of the settlement are categorised as being within flood zone C1. It is the Councils' opinion that no suitable alternative site can be found outside the flood risk area therefore it has been necessary to identify alternative locations in the settlement's catchment area to assist in meeting the requirement for housing.</p> <p>Suitable sites have been found in Penrhyndeudraeth and Criccieth to help meet Porthmadog's housing requirement.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	
				Penrhyndeudraeth and Criccieth due to flooding problems.	<p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was submitted which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 8) Pwllheli

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
411	Dr Richard Roberts [2938]	POLICY TAI14, T29 - Land near Lôn Caernarfon, Pwllheli	Object	No evidence of local housing need that can justify the number that has been designated. Building so many houses would have a detrimental impact on the Welsh language.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary</p>
1288	Mr Iwan Edgar [251]	POLICY TAI14, T29 - Land near Lôn Caernarfon, Pwllheli	Object	<p>We object to developing this green land for environmental, landscape and visual reasons (C1 (soundness tests)).</p> <p>Approving development here would be unacceptable as it would be linear and would adjoin the highway, it is green land and indigenous trees and bushes would be lost.</p> <p>It is also in a narrow corridor with steep sides and used to be a landscape conservation area. Any development would involve excavation and would ruin a gateway of beautiful landscape into the</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				town.  A further consideration is that the community of Pwllheli does not require this additional number of houses.	<p>infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1346	Cyngor Tref Pwllheli (Mr Robin W Hughes) [1235]	POLICY TAI14, T29 - Land near Lôn Caernarfon, Pwllheli	Object	Need to delete for the following reasons:  1. Sufficient settlement provision. 2. Ecological reasons.	
1347	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TAI14, T29 - Land near Lôn Caernarfon, Pwllheli	Object	We object to the allocation for housing of site T29 on land near the Caernarfon Road on grounds of unacceptable ribbon development, damaging landscape impact and significant traffic and access issues. We think alternative sites could be identified in other parts of Pwllheli and in accessible satellite centres such as Y Ffôr.	
1411	Julie O'Neil [3350]	POLICY TAI14, T29 - Land near Lôn Caernarfon, Pwllheli	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inhospitable combination of North South Facing Valley and polluting main road.</li> <li>Planning housing for today needs attached indoor amenities - sports etc.</li> <li>Looking ahead: Ribbon development will not suffice; still need a proper new village.</li> <li>The "investment" homes question.</li> <li>Widening/straightening of the main road is necessary re. even less housing &amp; amenities space.</li> </ol>	
1427	Brian Jones [2173]	POLICY TAI14, T29 - Land near Lôn Caernarfon, Pwllheli	Object	Dismayed at seeing the suggestion to replace land that was to be used for an industrial site was now to be included for housing and a considerable amount of land added as well. I thought that the	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Council had been forward thinking with the allocation of this land for industrial use as there is a good chance that the site of the existing industrial estate will be lost with the upcoming rising tides. Surely there are other candidates who have put up land for housing. It would be possible to build a road from this land to gain access to land above it which would be just as suitable for housing.	
1602	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T29 - Land near Lôn Caernarfon, Pwllheli	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1603	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T29 - Land near Lôn Caernarfon, Pwllheli	Object	<p>* A hydraulic modelling assessment (HMA) may be required to determine the point of connection to the public sewerage system and potential developers would be expected to fund investigations during pre-planning stages.</p> <p>* Pwllheli Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
84	Mr Tony Elliott	POLICY TAI14, T30 -	Object	The dangerous hill Salem Terrace/Allt	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[2717]	Deiniol Field, Pwllheli		<p>Salem (the only access between the proposed developments and Pwllheli town centre) would become even more dangerous through increased use, and the lack of pavements and lack of room to build any would put pedestrians at particular risk.</p> <p>The present infrastructure is inadequate for the proposed developments and changing it would be intrusive and alter the character of the area.</p> <p>The proposed developments are on a scale that is too big for Penrallt and would involve encroachment on surrounding countryside and harm the environment.</p> <p>The hockey field should be used for educational, recreational and community purposes.</p> <p>Removal of the sites T30 and T31 from the proposed development plan and policy.</p>	<p>The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p>
208	Derek Soane [2783]	POLICY TAI14, T30 - Deiniol Field, Pwllheli	Object	<p>Allt Salem is not capable of taking the much increased capacity created by the proposed developments T30 and T31, because of the lack of service facilities and infrastructure, and automatic increase of traffic on an already restricted access.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Alternative sites for housing developments should be investigated where facilities are easier.	removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.
413	Dr Richard Roberts [2938]	POLICY TAI14, T30 - Deiniol Field, Pwllheli	Object	No evidence of local need for housing which justifies the number allocated. Adverse impact upon the Welsh language from building so many.	<b>No Change</b>
1604	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T30 - Deiniol Field, Pwllheli	Object	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1605	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T30 - Deiniol Field, Pwllheli	Object	* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. * Pwllheli Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Comment Noted</b> <b>Recommendation</b> The Councils will continue to have ongoing discussions with DCWW on the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
415	Dr Richard Roberts [2938]	POLICY TAI14, T31 - Former Hockey Field, Pwllheli	Object	No evidence for local need to justify the number of houses proposed. Building so many houses will have a detrimental effect on the Welsh language.	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
1606	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T31 - Former Hockey Field, Pwllheli	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1607	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI14, T31 - Former Hockey Field, Pwllheli	Object	<p>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>* Pwllheli Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1831	Derek Soane [2783]	POLICY TAI14, T31 - Former Hockey Field, Pwllheli	Object	<p>Allt Salem is not capable of taking the much increased capacity created by the proposed developments T30 and T31, because of the lack of service facilities and infrastructure, and automatic increase of traffic on an already restricted access.</p> <p>Alternative sites for housing developments should be investigated</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				where facilities are easier.	consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.
1832	Mr Tony Elliott [2717]	POLICY TAI14, T31 - Former Hockey Field, Pwllheli	Object	<p>The dangerous hill Salem Terrace/Allt Salem (the only access between the proposed developments and Pwllheli town centre) would become even more dangerous through increased use, and the lack of pavements and lack of room to build any would put pedestrians at particular risk.</p> <p>The present infrastructure is inadequate for the proposed developments and changing it would be intrusive and alter the character of the area.</p> <p>The proposed developments are on a scale that is too big for Penrallt and would involve encroachment on surrounding countryside and harm the environment.</p> <p>The hockey field should be used for educational, recreational and community purposes.</p> <p>Removal of the sites T30 and T31 from the proposed development plan and policy.</p>	<p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
994	Mr Gwyn Llewelyn Jones [77]	Map 8 - Pwllheli	Object	The Plan seeks land for 291 houses in Pwllheli. 110 of these will be windfall - how realistic is this? There isn't enough land to deliver these numbers. The	<p><b>Accepted</b> Objectors have drawn attention to legitimate issues relating to allocation T29's ability to deliver the number of units set</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>"Assessing Pwllheli's development land potential" report shows that consideration has been given to land in the Denio area, but it was not brought to the plan due to development costs, without giving consideration to smaller developments. Gwyn Jones owns the land, he was brought up there and he farms the land. Positive opinion has been received from the Highways Department (see the enclosed letter). The NFU and the police also support Gwyn Jones building a house on the land. On this basis, we believe that the land displayed on the map is suitable for development. Change the development boundary to include the Ysgubor Wen section of land for up to four houses (see enclosed map).</p>	<p>out in Policy TAI14 (the presence of a stream and trees on part of the site, and the site's topography and shape means that it is unlikely that the site will deliver 30 dwellings per hectare). On this premise the Unit has reviewed objections relating to amendments to the development boundary to determine whether minor amendments could be made to ensure sufficient flexibility within the Plan to deliver the Plan's strategy and objectives.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No issues were raised about this site during the plan preparation process and forms a reasonable extension to the existing built form. Amend the development boundary to include the site to help towards achieving the indicative figure for the settlement.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF118</b></p>
1049	Owen Lloyd [3189]	Map 8 - Pwllheli	Object	<p>The Plan's allocation of housing land in Pwllheli is inadequate in terms of its proportion of the 55% target for delivery in the Primary Settlements and the town's continued role as an Urban Service Centre. The over-dependence of the proposed housing on a single large site (T29) will effectively create an urban extension of ribbon development on "greenfield" land with poor connectivity to the town centre. The whole of Candidate Site SP765 is excluded from the Proposals Map, despite the</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>opportunity to provide housing on "brownfield" land on the edge of town centre - thereby providing a more sustainable alternative.</p> <p>In the light of the above representations, the changes required would be an amendment of the Pwllheli development boundary to include 10-15 acres of land along and adjacent to the Ala Road frontage.</p>	<p>details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1050	R K Jones [3194]	Map 8 - Pwllheli	Object	<p>Support the inclusion of SP858 Penmaen Estate Land in the Candidate Site Register. There are comments in the initial responses to the application that the main drawback to its inclusion are associated with access issues</p> <p>May I respectfully point out that access to potential small scale development sites from the villages of Penrhos and Efailnewydd are already in place; and could quite easily accommodate additional vehicular access The land above Ala Road Pwllheli despite being close to the skyline could with sensitive development ease the pressure on housing estates and business premises in the town which are under increasing threat of rising water levels as a result of</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>climate change It is inevitable that this land will need to be utilised for building purposes in the medium term future I am also aware that a proportion of the land is offered protection under Historic Parks and Gardens designation and is as a result unsuitable for development The same applies to all land adjacent to Afon Rhydhir which floods on a regular basis.</p>	<p>need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1435	H & V Williams [2145]	Map 8 - Pwllheli	Object	<p>The site hasn't been included within the development boundary on the map. Having looked at the sustainability appraisal and the content of Topic Paper 1A, I am of the opinion that the information included in this document highlights the site's suitability for housing development.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Objectors have drawn attention to legitimate issues relating to allocation T29's ability to deliver the number of units set out in Policy TA14 (the presence of a stream and trees on part of the site, and the site's topography and shape means that it is unlikely that the site will deliver 30 dwellings per hectare). On this premise the Unit has reviewed objections relating to amendments to the development boundary to determine whether minor amendments could be made to ensure sufficient flexibility within the Plan to deliver the Plan's strategy and objectives.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No issues were raised about the lower portion of this site during the plan preparation process and forms a reasonable extension to the existing built form. Therefore in line with the Plan's spatial strategy and in order to ensure</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>sufficient flexibility within the Plan the Unit is exploring the potential to include the southern part of the objection site within the development boundary. Amend development boundary to include the site to help towards achieving the indicative figure for the settlement.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF119</b></p>

### 9) Beaumaris

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
537	Cyngor Tref Biwmares (Prof TW Ashenden) [1267]	Map 9 – Beaumaris	Object	<p>The Protected Open Space and Play Area marked at Happy Valley omits part of the relevant area. The Bowling Green, which is available for use by the public, has been omitted from the area marked.</p> <p>Change the marked areas as shown in the scanned document.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> The bowling Green is an established part of Beaumaris' leisure facilities</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Identify as Protected Open Space on the Inset Map</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF120</b></p>
1354	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T32 - Casita, Beaumaris	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make	<b>Note the Support</b>

### 10) Benllech

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1355	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T33 - Land adjoining Wendon Cafe,	Support	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* Potential developers need to be aware</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
		Benllech		<p>that the site is crossed by a sewer and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site.</p> <p>* Benllech Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<b>No Change</b>
1107	Mr M Williams-Bulkeley [3229]	Map 10 - Benllech	Object	<p>The Deposit JLDP allocated T33 for Housing in Benllech, which is classed as a Local Service Village. It is a popular settlement of some growing size and population. There is a growing market housing need here, and an even greater local affordable housing need. Allocation T33 is insufficient in size/density, and inappropriate in location, and is by its beach-side location is patently more attractive and appropriate for in-migrant retiree/holiday homes, for which there is intense demand, to the detriment of local persons in real housing need.</p> <p>According to need, Benllech should be allocated a more appropriately sized and located Housing Site. An alternative site for housing is proposed at Ffordd Amlwch, Benllech. Please refer to the comprehensive Supplementary Information document on the proposed site, dated March 20, 2015.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				The needs of local persons should override the demands of affluent in-migrants. Such needs are not recognised in the Plan.	The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.  <b>No Change</b>

## 11) Bodedern

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Representations
618	Bleddyn & Bethan Hughes [2121]	POLICY TAI15, T34 - Land near Llwyn Angharad, Bodedern	Support	<p>We fully support the new settlement in Bodedern village - Inset Map 11 - T34 at Treangharad. This plot is in a good location. The site/field is flat and well drained. There is good access to the site from the main road where there is good visibility both ways. There is a secondary school less than 100 yards north of the plot and a primary school approx. 700 yds. The site is on the bus and cycle route and is only one mile from the A55. The doctor's surgery with dispensing facilities, village shops are all within easy walking distance.</p> <p>If you require extra sites in Bodedern can you please consider plots on the same field beside the bungalow on map attached (T34) - (SP171)</p>	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b> Development boundaries are drawn around the urban form of settlements. The development boundary should be amended to include Rhoslwyn but not the plot of land as requested by the responder.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> To ensure the internal consistency of the plan the development boundary should be amended to include Rhoslwyn.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF121</b></p>
1356	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T34 - Land near Llwyn Angharad, Bodedern	Support	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Representations
				* Bodedern Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	
1282	Dr Cledwyn Hughes [129]	Map 11 - Bodedern	Object	Land at Sarn Gannu can be linked with allocation T34 to provide a comprehensive housing allocation which will meet the increased housing needs of Anglesey over the plan period given likely significant economic growth led by major infrastructure projects over the plan period. There is an under-supply of housing in the deposit Plan and an over reliance on existing commitments which have failed to deliver in the past, combined with an over reliance of windfall sites. Bodedern is a sustainable settlement with a primary and secondary school which could accommodate significant additional housing.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 12) Cemaes

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
504	J & A Parry [2980]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Support	This site is a logical location for new housing development within Cemaes Bay. It is well related to the existing urban area, has ready access to services and has a suitable road access. In addition, the developed site will have no deleterious impact on the visual amenity of the locality or on the landscape.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1300	Cyngor Cymuned Llanbadrig (Carli Evans-Thau) [1375]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Object	In 1990 an application to develop this site was refused following receipt of community survey highlighting the concerns of local residents and there being no safe access on to the highway. This issue is more apparent now than ever with an increase in traffic and road use. Parking is also a big problem in the immediate area. Residents have previously asked for pavements but the road is deemed to narrow and dangerous for pedestrian use.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development</p>
1303	Miss J Madoc-Jones [3298]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Object	<p>The land refT35 is first class agricultural land and was outside the original boundaries of Cemaes Bay, which have recently been extended to include plot T35.</p> <p>Land at Manora ref SP334 could be extended to link in with Maes Padrig and Maes Cynfor where similar housing already exists. Access for site SP334 extended to Maes Padrig would be from A5025 Holyhead Road with access from</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Maes Cynfor.</p> <p>Concerns for the development of T35 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road not designed or constructed to accommodate extra traffic use;</li> <li>2. Inadequate sewerage capacity for major development with serious problems in the past;</li> <li>3. Capacity of Cemaes Primary School to cope with additional pupils;</li> <li>4. Capacity issues relating to the ability of Cemaes Bay Surgery to cope with additional numbers.</li> </ol>	<p>in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary</p>
1304	Felicity Lillywhite [3299]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Object	<p>The land refT35 is first class agricultural land and was outside the original boundaries of Cemaes Bay, which have recently been extended to include plot T35.</p> <p>Land at Manora ref SP334 could be extended to link in with Maes Padrig and Maes Cynfor where similar housing already exists. Access for site SP334 extended to Maes Padrig would be from A5025 Holyhead Road with access from Maes Cynfor.</p> <p>Concerns for the development of T35 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road not designed or constructed to accommodate extra traffic use;</li> <li>2. Inadequate sewerage capacity for major development with serious</li> </ol>	<p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>problems in the past;</p> <p>3. Capacity of Cemaes Primary School to cope with additional pupils;</p> <p>4. Capacity issues relating to the ability of Cemaes Bay Surgery to cope with additional numbers.</p>	
1305	Glyn & Karen Williams [3300]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Object	<p>We are writing to lodge our objection to the change of use and proposed development of land located behind Lon Ysgubor. This land (T35) is located behind our property and runs alongside Ffordd y Felin which is adjacent to the primary school.</p> <p>To summarise, our objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of habitats, hedgerows and wildlife.</li> <li>2. Depreciation of value to property.</li> <li>3. Increase in risk to school children and pedestrians.</li> <li>4. The ability of sewage systems to cope.</li> <li>5. The increase in noise and possible crime impact.</li> <li>6. Reduction in quality of life for residents.</li> <li>7. Lack of consultation on changes to boundaries and housing needs.</li> </ol>	
1379	Miss Gweneth Mary Jones [3303]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Object	This land has always been agricultural land	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing
1397	Mrs Cerrie Douglass [2736]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of	Object	Dubious as to the reasons for not developing the land at Manora (SP334)	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
		Holyhead Road, Cemaes		directly behind Maes Cynfor and do not agree with the 'poor access' argument. There are capacity, parking and road safety issues associated with Cemaes Primary School. Arguments used to discount other sites are a matter of personal opinion. Firmly believe that the land in question is unsuitable for development. Risk of overdeveloping the village and killing the tourist industry. Capacity issues with the local GP. Also an issue with sewage systems. Impact on the Welsh Language.	requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.  Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.
1426	Mrs G. L. Tennet [3352]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Object	Strongly oppose development for the following grounds:  * impact on the free and safe flow of traffic, with particular reference to primary school; * inadequacy of infrastructure, including school, to support development; * site in an area of natural beauty and valuable wildlife; * impact on quality of life; * social housing would de-value properties.	
1823	Mr Thomas Conway [3371]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Object	* Wrong and misleading description for the site; * Feel there has been a lack of publicity for adjacent neighbours; * Having affordable housing in this location is contrary to original zoning policy with Council estates located elsewhere in the Village;	<b>Recommendation:</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Maes Cynfor estate was never completed with land to West of boundary available;</li> <li>* It is grade 3 agricultural land;</li> <li>* Limited capacity of sewage plant near Wylfa;</li> <li>* Anglesey document states no further development in Cemaes;</li> <li>* Refusal of previous residential application in 1990 on grounds of lack of need and road safety;</li> <li>* Adverse impact on value and amenity of adjacent houses;</li> <li>* Surface water problems with part of site;</li> <li>* An overage charge on the site impacts on its viability.</li> </ul>	
1357	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</li> <li>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</li> <li>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement may require improvements at Cemaes Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
954	Mr & Mrs H Rees [31]	Map 12 - Cemaes	Object	Candidate Site SP851 was initially not taken forward in the deposit plan as it was deemed to be in the open countryside. We now wish to resubmit it as an Alternative Site.	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>The site is situated within a cluster/settlement of 9 houses, all within walking distance of Cemaes and all its facilities/services.</p> <p>Development would be restricted to one eco-friendly property only.</p> <p>Accessible from public highway with adequate frontage to provide access. The site is within the geographical spread of the village and would fit within the medium growth option of the Spatial Strategy. (Consider Wylfa Newydd Requirements)</p>	<p>relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1390	Mr Llyr Jones [3307]	Map 12 - Cemaes	Object	<p>We wish to object to the Deposit Local Development Plan's development boundary for Cemaes. It is proposed that land to the west of the Football field should be included within the development boundary (as outlined in red on the attached plan).</p> <p>The site is within a sustainable location close to the A5025, a key public transport</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies,</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>route which will link the village with the planned Wylfa Newydd Nuclear Power Station.</p> <p>The land is also close to the local primary school and could be developed for housing.</p>	<p>supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1825	Mr Thomas Conway [3371]	Map 12 - Cemaes	Object	<p>* Summary of issues identified with SP334 Manora in topic paper 1A is incorrect, biased and based on an unjustified opinion;</p> <p>* The access to the site is suitable and easy and better than those for other estates in the settlement;</p> <p>* Existing access to the property on the site through the Maes Cynfor estate;</p> <p>* The original Maes Cynfor estate land provision extended in a westerly direction as far as the watercourse the original intention was to complete the estate before changes in National Policy in the 1980's;</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				* This area of land would be better suited for development than the T35 site.	<p>development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1826	Mr Thomas Conway [3371]	Map 12 - Cemaes	Object	<p>* Topic paper 1A states the site SP851 land adjacent to Hafod is in the countryside, but so is site T35;</p> <p>* Topic paper 1A states it is unsuitable for housing however no evidence is provided to support this statement;</p> <p>* It further states that the allocation would be contrary to National Policy &amp; JLDP strategy - both these are rejected as not applicable;</p> <p>* The group of houses around the Mill was identified as a Rural Cluster in the Interim Policy in 2011;</p> <p>* SP851 could be developed as the adjoining property Hafod house.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1827	Mr Thomas Conway [3371]	Map 12 - Cemaes	Object	<p>* Topic paper 1A states the site SP852 former Faraway Site is in the countryside, but so is site T35;</p> <p>* Topic paper 1A states it is unsuitable for housing however no evidence is provided to support this statement;</p> <p>* It further states that the allocation would be contrary to National Policy &amp; JLDP strategy - both these are rejected as not applicable;</p> <p>* This is the site of the former Faraway hotel and therefore is a brownfield site and should be given a priority for appropriate development;</p> <p>* The access has a steep gradient but never caused any difficulty for the hotel clients nor for the usage in the intervening years for industrial type storage by a local builder;</p> <p>* Should be allocated as a future high quality housing of appropriate size.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the alternative site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					No Change

### 13) Gaerwen

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1121	Mrs Sioned Jones [3235]	Map 13 - Gaerwen	Object	<p>The Deposit LDP allocates no land for housing in Gaerwen, which is classed as a Local Service Village. It is a settlement of some growing size and population. There is a growing market housing need here, and an even greater affordable housing need. Such needs are not recognised in the Plan.</p> <p>According to the need, Gaerwen should be allocated a Housing site. An alternative site for Housing is proposed, at Lôn Graig, Gaerwen. Please refer to the Supplementary Information document on the proposed site, dated March 20, 2015.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1124	Christine Webster [3236]	Map 13 - Gaerwen	Object	<p>We wish to object to the lack of allocation of housing within the Local Service Centre of Gaerwen and to the exclusion of the site which surrounds Gaerwen Uchaf Business Park (as identified in red on the attached plan) from the development boundary of Gaerwen. We wish to propose that the site is included within the development boundary and allocated for mixed use development comprising of housing, public open space, community facilities development within the settlement.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 14) Llanfairpwll

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1358	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T36 - Land near Bryn Eira, Llanfairpwll	Object	<p>* Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by a water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the density achievable on site.</p> <p>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991</p> <p>* Llanfairpwll Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1334	Mr TC Roberts [3231]	POLICY TAI15, T37 - Land near Penmynydd Road, Llanfairpwll	Object	<p>Site T37 is not the optimum housing site for the settlement of Llanfairpwll, because -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In locational terms it is not the most sustainable</li> <li>2. In locational terms it is not the most accessible</li> <li>3. The Alternative Site now available and proposed at 2d, was not proposed as a Candidate Site</li> <li>4. The Deposit Plan is unsound if it does not consider and accept the Alternative Site.</li> </ol> <p>Site T37 should be OMITTED in favour of the Alternative Site now available and</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>proposed at - Land at Lon Refail Llanfairpwll LL61 5YY OS GRID REF. SH 53536 72021</p> <p>(see comment 1109)</p>	<p>suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1359	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T37 - Land near Penmynydd Road, Llanfairpwll	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
723	Mr & Mrs Brooke [3081]	Map 14 - Llanfairpwll	Support	it is considered that the land allocated for housing within the Local Service Centre of Llanfairpwll should remain within the Local Development Plan. The site adjoins the current UDP boundary along its	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				northern boundary and also adjoins the settlement's built form in terms of the residential properties of Y Wern estate. The site forms a logical and sustainable extension to the settlement with the A55 creating a physical boundary preventing intrusion into the open countryside.	<p>relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1109	Mr TC Roberts [3231]	Map 14 - Llanfairpwll	Object	<p>Site T36 is not the optimum housing site for the settlement of Llanfairpwll because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In locational terms it is not the most sustainable</li> <li>2. In locational terms it is not the most accessible</li> <li>3. The Alternative Site now available and proposed at 2d, was not proposed as a Candidate Site</li> </ol>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies,</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>4. The Deposit Plan is unsound if it does not consider and accept the Alternative Site.</p> <p>Site T36 should be omitted in favour of the Alternative Site now available and proposed at: Land at Lon Refail, Llanfairpwll, LL61 5YY, OS Grid Ref: SH53536 72021</p>	<p>supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1388	Mr & Mrs Brooke [3081]	Map 14 - Llanfairpwll	Object	<p>We wish to propose an extension to the allocated site on land adjacent to Bryn Eira for housing. Part of the site has been allocated for housing within the centre of Llanfairpwll to accommodate 30 units. It is considered that extending the allocated site to include fields to the east would ensure that the level of housing is maintained over the plan period and would ensure that there is sufficient land within the boundary to accommodate for the identified housing need.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 15) Menai Bridge

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1360	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T38 - Ty Mawr, Menai Bridge	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1361	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T39 - Tyddyn Mostyn, Menai Bridge	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1362	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T40 - Land near Lôn Gamfa, Menai Bridge	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>proposed development site.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted within the catchment area of Treborth WwTW would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
927	Mr & Mrs Brooke [3081]	Map 15 - Menai Bridge	Object	<p>We wish to propose a site off Mount Street be included in the development boundary of Menai Bridge. The site is identified as being located immediately adjoining the development boundary in 3 directions. The proposed inclusion of the site within the development boundary will assist in providing windfall sites to accommodate the housing need over the plan period. It is considered that the site would form a reasonable extension to the development boundary sensitively infilling a small gap between existing housing to accommodate the identified housing need.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Development boundaries are drawn around the urban form of settlements. This site forms a natural rounding off the development boundary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>To ensure the internal consistency of the plan the development boundary should be amended to include the site.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF122</b></p>
1017	Watkin Jones (Mr Stuart Hardy) [3159]	Map 15 - Menai Bridge	Object	<p>Land adj Tyddyn Isaf. The above information, which is supplemented by a comprehensive sustainability appraisal of the site, indicates that the site is suitable for housing and should be included as a candidate/allocated site within the JLDP. The site is accessible, available, deliverable and developable and can help Anglesey/Gwynedd meet its housing requirements throughout the plan period. It is therefore considered to be</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				appropriate to be brought forward due to its highly sustainable location in Menai Bridge, which is recognised within the JLDP as a priority area for development.	<p>set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1018	Watkin Jones (Mr Stuart Hardy) [3159]	Map 15 - Menai Bridge	Object	<p>Pentraeth Automotive, Henffordd, Menai Bridge. The above information, which is supplemented by a comprehensive sustainability appraisal of the site, indicates that the site is suitable for other uses, preferably for housing (or leisure/retail) and should be included as a candidate/allocated site within the JLDP. The site is brownfield land and as such the principle of built development has already been established. Whilst the site is not currently available, there is reasonable prospect that it would become available in the future. The site is deliverable and developable and can help Anglesey/Gwynedd meet to</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				development requirements.	<p>impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1157	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	Map 15 - Menai Bridge	Object	<p>Land opp Tafarn Four Crosses, Menai Bridge. We wish to object to the development boundary of Menai Bridge. We wish to propose a site on land to the north-west of the Four Crosses Roundabout to be included within the development boundary of Menai Bridge for the allocation of mixed use development on the site is considered to be deliverable due to the site's merits of being located in a popular, accessible and sustainable location, having excellent social and transport links with the nearby regional centre of Bangor.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 16) Pentraeth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1159	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	Map 16 - Pentraeth	Object	<p>Meithrinfa Pentraeth Nursery, Pentraeth. Pentraeth has been categorised as a Local Service Centre under Policy TAI15. It is identified within Strategic Policy PS15 that at least 20% of the plan's growth is located within Local Service Centres. However, no land has been allocated within Pentraeth for housing. It is considered that there is an over-reliance on windfall sites with the LDP. It is not considered that there is sufficient landbank within the development boundary to accommodate the identified housing need. Therefore, we wish to propose a brownfield site at Pentraeth Nursery to be included within the development plan and allocated for housing.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1160	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	Map 16 - Pentraeth	Object	<p>Land at Glanrafon, Pentraeth. Pentraeth has been categorised as a Local Service Centre under Policy TAI15. It is identified within Strategic Policy P1S15 that at least 20% of the plan's growth is located within Local Service Centres. However, no land has been allocated within Pentraeth for housing. It is considered that there is an over-reliance on windfall sites within the Local Development Plan. It is not considered that there is sufficient landbank within the development boundary to accommodate the identified housing need. We wish to propose the Glanrafon site for inclusion in the development boundary and allocated for housing.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.  <b>No Change</b>

### 17) Rhosneigr

- No Representations

### 18) Valley

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1363	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T41 - Former Cattle Market site, Valley	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site. * Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figures.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1045	Strutt and Parker (Jo Remond) [3188]	Map 18 - Valley	Object	Land adj Bryn Derwen, Valley. The Authority needs to increase the level of housing than currently planned for to meet expected housing need. For example, in order to meet the needs of Wylfa construction workers, a degree of whom are likely to permanently relocate to Anglesey. There are a number of smaller sustainable settlements, including Valley/Gorad which have the capacity to	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.  Furthermore, the Plan's policies,



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				accommodate more growth than currently planned for.	<p>supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 19) Barmouth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
978	Mr Rob Bonser [3143]	Map 19 - Barmouth	Object	There are serious errors in the judgements and methods used to calculate the urban capacity for Barmouth detailed in Topic Paper 6 resulting in a significant and inappropriate reliance on the conversion of existing large houses and commercial properties and the contribution of the empty homes strategy. The inclusion of	<p><b>Accepted</b> Development boundaries are drawn around the urban form of settlements. The land in question is considered to be part of Barmouth's urban form.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> To ensure the internal consistency of the plan the development boundary should be</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>this brownfield site, which has been the subject of previous planning consents for residential development, within the development boundary for Barmouth, would help support and achieve the required indicative windfall provision of 81 dwelling units in Policy TAI15. Redrafting of the development boundary for Barmouth indicated on Inset Map 19 to include this site.</p>	<p>amended to include the land in question.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF123</b></p>
1387	Mr Bruce Davies [3305]	Map 19 - Barmouth	Object	<p>The land for which Planning Permission was granted on the 1st July 2009 whilst the Unitary Development Plan was still current (and is to the present day) should be re-included within the Development Boundary for Barmouth.</p> <p>The land met Planning Policy requirements at that time and thus must hold to be in accord with policies at present time since the UDP had not yet been superseded by the LDP.</p> <p>Barmouth has been identified in the LDP consultation process as requiring 27 no. dwellings to fulfil its housing requirements for the term of the LDP. This site represents a parcel of land that was previously considered suitable for development under the UDP but would also meet planning windfall criteria.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1707	Cyngor Tref Abermaw (Ms Sue Phillips) [3318]	Map 19 - Barmouth	Object	<p>As planning permission for two dwellings has previously been approved on this land, and in light of the fact that some 90 new dwellings are recommended for the Barmouth area (a number which may not be achieved within the existing time frame), the Town Council is in unanimous agreement that the area of land owned by Mr Evans (adjacent to his home, and previously having been granted planning permission for two dwellings) should be included within the development area.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

20) Abersoch

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
953	Emlyn Williams [2153]	Map 20 - Abersoch	Object	<p>I submit that part of the land shown on the proposal map under reference SP352 should be included as land suitable for housing in the future. It is not an encroachment into open countryside but would in fact be infill between already existing housing areas. The benefit from existing mains services and access to the adjoining highway. It is well sheltered and would not be detrimental to the visual amenity. Development would support local employment and residential need. Test of soundness (CE2) - The strategy, policies and allocations are not realistic and appropriate having considered the relevant alternatives.</p> <p>Extend the development boundary to include land as shown on the attached plan.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
956	Mr Rod Thompson	Map 20 - Abersoch	Object	The settlement boundary drawn on the	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[3125]			<p>inset map for Abersoch splits the curtilage of the property (shown edged red on the attached plan) into two. It is illogical that half of the curtilage of the property should be excluded from the settlement boundary particularly when it is adjoined on three sides by residential development that lie within the settlement boundary and on the fourth side by the Cors Llyferin SSSI where further expansion of the settlement would not be permitted.</p> <p>Modification of the Settlement Boundary for Abersoch as indicated on the attached plan</p>	<p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1026	Mr Daniel Bufton [321]	Map 20 - Abersoch	Object	<p>Extend the village boundary along Lon Garmon for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Not enough plots available to build the further dwellings in Abersoch</li> <li>* Strong demand for local housing in and around the Abersoch area.</li> <li>* The site is a sustainable, feasible, suitable and a deliverable site, free of development constraints such as issues with drainage, access &amp; flooding.</li> <li>* Form a sensible development boundary as is adjoining to the existing building line.</li> <li>* The site is on a major public transport (bus) route and within close proximity, therefore walking distance of all of Abersoch's amenities, shops, school, banks, etc.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>* The site is NOT within the AONB, but a conservation area</p> <p>* There is good access.</p>	
1027	Mr Alex Badley [255]	Map 20 - Abersoch	Object	<p>Whilst we acknowledge and support the identification of Abersoch as a Local Service Centre, we object to Policy TAI15 on the grounds that no sites are identified as housing land allocations within the settlement. We also object on the grounds that the site promoted (Hen Dy Farm - SP 830) is excluded from the schedule of housing allocations under this policy.</p> <p>We contend that insufficient provision is made in the local service centre of Abersoch as there is limited scope within the existing settlement boundary to provide for local housing needs, including affordable housing.</p> <p>By not providing for necessary growth in such a sustainable settlement the Deposit Plan fails Test of Soundness C2 and CE2.</p> <p>The site in question should be allocated for 90 dwellings in subsequent Focused Changes. This would be of a scale compatible with the role and function of Abersoch and its status as a Local Service Centre.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1292	Council for the Protection of Rural	Map 20 - Abersoch	Object	We question whether 65 windfall/infill sites could be found within the village	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]			development boundary of Abersoch and would prefer a suitable housing site to be identified. If there is evidence of genuine need for additional affordable/local housing on this scale, then in principle we would support use of SP830 (south) adjacent to the village boundary in the west. We would oppose other candidate site proposals on the Sarn Bach road and in Machroes further from the village boundary, or in Mynytho, principally on grounds of adverse landscape impact.	<p>new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 21) Bethesda

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1635	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C17 - Felin Fawr, Bethesda	Support	<p>* Our local water network should be sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer. Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.</p> <p>* Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1200	RCH Douglas Pennant [3070]	Map 21 - Bethesda	Object	<p>We do not believe that there is sufficient existing land bank and windfall sites within the Bethesda development boundary to meet the indicative level of growth. A wider settlement boundary should be drawn to include the land adj Maes Coetmor site which was within the UDP development boundary.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 22) Criccieth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1085	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	POLICY TAI15, T42 - Land near North Terrace, Criccieth	Object	Although, the site is not identified as being within a flood risk zone, NRW is aware of a history of flooding from the Afon Cwrt which flows through the site. The river enters a culvert at the bottom of the site, and any blockage of the screen could increase flood risk. Due to the steep nature of the land, it is unlikely that flooding would affect a large proportion of the site. However, NRW would expect any planning application to be supported by a Flood Consequence Assessment to ensure that development is adequately protected.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1364	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	POLICY TAI15, T42 - Land near North	Object	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]	Terrace, Criccieth		<p>* Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement may require improvements at Criccieth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p>DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1380	Mr Maldwyn Evans [2619]	Map 22 – Criccieth	Object	<p>We live at Helidon, L.on Merllyn, Criccieth and have a protected open space area as per the deposit plan in our garden.</p> <p>A number of houses have been built either side of the garden e.g. "Broadlands" "Fern Dell" and a number of houses have been built over the last few years on the opposite side of the A497 in Morannedd.</p> <p>The garden can only be seen by high sided vehicles from the main road. There is also a separate access to the garden from the right hand side of the property.</p> <p>Delete the protected open space status.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Curtilage of garden with no public recreational value</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Remove protected open space status.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF124</b></p>

## 23) Llanberis

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1365	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T43 - Land near Victoria Hotel, Llanberis	Support	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</p> <p>* Llanberis Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
377	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY TAI15, T44 - Land near Tŷ Du Road, Llanberis	Object	This area is also a woodland local WS	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p>The site has planning permission and development has started. Biodiversity issues were discussed and mitigated during the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1366	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T44 - Land near Tŷ Du Road, Llanberis	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
917	Ann Sweeney [2052]	Map 23 - Llanberis	Object	This area would be ideal for families having gardens and walking to the school and village. The road at Church Lane could be easily widened on my land to provide passing, parking and the building of some new houses (A small number).	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				I would like to see the boundary extended to include this area and allow for people to have small and affordable house in a very pleasant rural area , with lots of space around. Llanberis is a thriving village and we need to provide for our young people. (CE4).	<p>that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
995	John M Prydderch Roberts [3157]	Map 23 - Llanberis	Object	The Boundary for Llanberis does not extend enough as it has not taken into account my proposed site which falls well within the Village boundary and is not within the Countryside. The site is immediately opposite an area of residential development and is placed within two main roads. The site is not a Greenfield site but a Brownfield site and very suitable for development. I understand for the settlement of	<p><b>Accepted</b> Agree that the site forms part of the settlement's built form and its inclusion within the development boundary would: provide sufficient flexibility within the Plan to achieve the indicative windfall figure for Llanberis; align with the Plan's spatial strategy; and ensure the internal consistency of the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Llanberis Indicative additional number of housing required is 53 to 2026 therefore, additional suitable sites in Llanberis is limited therefore not to be missed.  To include my suggested site as per enclosed map	Amend Development boundary to include the land in question.  <b>Focussed Change NF125</b>
1672	Guy (Paddy) Smith [2101]	Map 23 - Llanberis	Object	The community of Llainwen, Tŷ Du Road and Yankee Street have extreme concern about the proposed inclusion of site SP427 as a suitable housing development site in the joint local development plan. Whilst we note and agree with your consideration at review that access to this site and ensuring traffic and parking problems it will cause are prohibitive to its success, we would like to add in objection the well known and recorded history of this site as a flood plain. We feel this is also prohibitive to its development and subsequent property insurance issues.	<b>Not Accepted</b> Site is not included in the JDLP.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change necessary as the site is not included within the Deposit Plan.  <b>No Change</b>

## 24) Llanrug

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1367	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T45 - Church Field, Llanrug	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1295	Mr Ian Trevor [2930]	POLICY TAI15, T46 -	Object	Land opposite former Hafod garage,	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
		Land near Rhythallt Road, Llanrug		<p>Llanrug: proposed housing allocation &amp; inclusion within development boundary of Llanrug.</p> <p>* Proposed site is a sustainable development proposal.</p> <p>* The suggested site is an appropriate addition to the settlement, and would perform better against the LDP's criteria than site T46.</p> <p>Deletion of housing allocation T46</p>	<p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1368	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T46 - Land near Rhythallt Road, Llanrug	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
981	Cyngor Cymuned	Map 24 - Llanrug	Support	At a recent meeting of the Community	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Llanrug. (Mr Meirion Jones) [3134]			<p>Council, Councillor Charles Jones explained the amendments to the above Plan and that he, as a Local Member, was very happy with the amendments. This was endorsed unanimously by the Community Council and I was requested to contact you to express the Community Council's satisfaction with the plan and to express gratitude to you for considering local concerns.</p> <p>The Council intends to contact you again in future to express their views on the type of housing they are eager to see being approved in Llanrug.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1011	Mr D M Price [274]	Map 24 - Llanrug	Object	<p>I wish to submit an alternative site for consideration in the plan for the village of Llanrug.</p> <p>This land was located within the development boundary of Llanrug in the consultative version of the Unitary Development Plan in 2002 which in my opinion acknowledges the suitability of the site to be included as an alternative site.</p> <p>The site is located in the centre of the village, adjacent to the Minffordd estate which means that the sewerage infrastructure and the mains water and electricity systems are conveniently located for the site.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				There is a lack of affordable housing in the village and the document notes that there is a need for 14 extra units. I believe that it is crucially important for the sustainability of Welsh communities that there is sufficient affordable housing provision for local people to enable them to remain within their localities.	<p>new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1123	Mr Ian Trevor [2930]	Map 24 - Llanrug	Object	<p>Land opposite former Hafod garage, Llanrug: proposed housing allocation &amp; inclusion within development boundary of Llanrug in place of T46.</p> <p>* Proposed site is a sustainable development proposal. * The suggested site is an appropriate addition to the settlement, and would perform better against the LDP's criteria than site T46.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.  <b>No Change</b>

## 25) Nefyn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1369	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T47 - Land near Helyg, Nefyn	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that will need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town &amp; Country Planning Act 1990.</p> <p>* Nefyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1370	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T48 - Former Allotments, Nefyn	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
719	Council for the	Map 25 - Nefyn	Object	27.1 We have no objection to site T47	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]			which involves a logical extension to the eastern boundary of the town. There is no explanation of why land near the Holborn Estate included in the GUDP for housing has been deleted and the boundary redrawn. Similarly, an isolated development area to the south east of the town in the GUDP has been deleted from JLDP.	<p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1040	Lord Newborough [3187]	Map 25 - Nefyn	Object	The proposed allocation of alternative site known as Land at Nefyn (East of Y Fron) for 16 residential units. Site is supported for the following reasons: Deliverability - Positive Planning. Allocated Housing Numbers	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Development Principle Opportunities and Constraints - As attached at Appendix 1 Indicative Masterplan - As attached at Appendix 2 Positive Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Allocation of additional site known as Land at Nefyn (East of Y Fron) to provide 16 residential units as indicated on the Opportunities and Constraints Plan. A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out and is included in the supporting documentation.</p>	<p>that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1041	Lord Newborough [3187]	Map 25 - Nefyn	Object	<p>The proposed allocation of alternative site known as Site South of Nefyn off A497 for 16 residential units. Site is supported for the following reasons: Deliverability - Positive Planning. Allocated Housing Numbers Development Principle Opportunities and Constraints - As attached at Appendix 1 Indicative Masterplan - As attached at Appendix 2</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Positive Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>Allocation of additional site known as Site South of Nefyn off A497 to provide 16 residential units as indicated on the Opportunities and Constraints Plan. A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out and is included in the supporting documentation.</p>	<p>set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 26) Penrhyndeudraeth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1371	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T49 - Canol Cae, Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</li> <li>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</li> <li>* The foul flows would lead to Penrhyndeudraeth Pumping Station (SPS) and an assessment of this SPS may be needed to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether</li> </ul>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed. * Penrhyndeudraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	
1372	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T50 - Land near former Bron Garth Hospital, Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site. * The foul flows would lead to Penrhyndeudraeth Pumping Station (SPS) and an assessment of this SPS may be needed to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed. * Penrhyndeudraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1373	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T51 - Land near Canol Cae, Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site. * The foul flows would lead to Penrhyndeudraeth Pumping Station (SPS) and an assessment of this SPS may be needed to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed. * Penrhyndeudraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	
1430	Cyngor Tref Penrhyndeudraeth (Mr Glyn Roberts) [1261]	Map 26 - Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	Porthmadog's needs should not be satisfied in Penrhyndeudraeth because: * Motoring difficulties along streets, which will be exacerbated anyway when Pont Briwet is completed; * Parking is a major problem; * No room to expand the school; * Create difficulties to gain access to the surgery car park, where an accident occurred in 2015. Intense consideration needs to be given to these spatial and traffic issues.	<b>Not Accepted</b> Although Porthmadog is defended against flooding, large parts of the settlement are categorised as being within Zone C1. A core function of the Plan is to ensure that all development is sustainable, having regard to the implications of addressing climate change. Development proposals that would lead to a reduction in floodplain storage capacity or impede flood flows are strongly discouraged. On this basis and the lack of alternative sites beyond the flood risk area, the Plan cannot allocate land for housing in Porthmadog.
1437	Cyngor Gwynedd (Cyng/Counc Gareth Thomas) [402]	Map 26 - Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	I object to the fact that Penrhyndeudraeth has to absorb more housing units because Porthmadog is unable to accept its quota of housing. I understand the reason for this, in that Porthmadog is in an area at risk of flooding. But the requirement that adjoining towns like Penrhyndeudraeth and Criccieth accept additional housing is completely unacceptable for a number of reasons, which includes: capacity of streets to deal with extra traffic, capacity of Ysgol Cefn Coch, the surgery and car park, as well as doubt about the suitability and therefore the viability of	Criccieth and Penrhyndeudraeth have been chosen after taking into account a range of factors. Both Local Service Centres have good transport links with Porthmadog and each one has a good level of services that provide their residents the opportunity to walk to them to satisfy their everyday requirements, thus reducing the need for journeys to Porthmadog.  <b>Recommendation</b> The JPPU commissioned Ymgynghoriaeth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				sites allocated for housing.	<p>Gwynedd Consultancy to undertake a stage 2 Strategic Flood Consequences Assessment for Porthmadog so that the Unit could address objections 1430 and 1437 and therefore ascertain whether there were any development opportunities in Porthmadog that would align with the requirements of TAN15. The SFCA2 concluded that the accessible sites for development in the town were all subject to flood risk. As indicated in section 3 of this report the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1669	Mr Geraint Evans [2855]	Map 26 - Penrhyndeudraeth	Object	We object to the development boundary which runs through the centre of our property. The stable is outside the development boundary and the line of the boundary does not follow any	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b> Development boundaries are drawn around the urban form of settlements. Agree that the stable forms parts of the settlement's built form.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				physical of visual line to the south of the buildings. This will lead to uncertainty when assessing policy and will reduce the option to extend the B&B enterprise. As a listed building there is an opportunity to change the use of the stable to safeguard the building for the future. The entire property is considered to be an essential part of the town and its built form. According to our Sustainability Appraisal the site is suitable to be included within the development boundary.	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> To ensure the internal consistency of the plan the development boundary should be amended to include the stable but the remainder of the garden should not be included as the plan follows physical boundaries, where possible, and not land ownership.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF126</b></p>

## 27) Penygroes

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
370	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY TAI15, T52 - Land near Maes Dulyn, Penygroes	Object	This area includes part of a local WS	<p><b>Comment Noted</b> The western side of the allocation is identified as a Candidate Wildlife site. Discussions with the Biodiversity Unit state that this field does not contain a habitat of high value but there is a hedge ditch which is worth retaining.</p> <p><b>Recommendations</b> In lieu of comments from the Biodiversity Unit no change is required to plan</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
371	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY TAI15, T52 - Land near Maes Dulyn, Penygroes	Object	This area includes part of a local WS	
1374	Dwr Cymru Welsh	POLICY TAI15, T52 -	Support	A water supply can be provided to serve	<b>Note the Support</b>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Land near Maes Dulyn, Penygroes		this site. Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site. Potential developers need to be aware that the site is crossed by a sewer and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site. Llanllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
925	Mr Malcolm Love [3106]	Map 27 - Penygroes, Gwynedd	Object	<p>I object to the plan as I want the land behind Maes Llyn (No:854, map inset 27) to be included within the development boundary in order to build a house on it. I live in a small terraced house in Penygroes and need a larger house in order to accommodate my growing family. It is currently impossible for me to purchase another house in the area because they are out of my price range. The land behind Maes Llyn is in an ideal location for building a house without extending the development boundary out of Penygroes, by infilling between the Cefn Faes houses and the Penygroes Factory.</p> <p>I wish to see changes made to the deposit plan to include land 854 (map inset 27) in</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				the dwelling boundary.	<p>new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 28) Tywyn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1375	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T53 - Sŵn y Tonnau, Tywyn	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1376	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI15, T54 - Garreglwyd, Tywyn	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1624	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY CYF1, C9 - Pendre Estate, Tywyn	Support	<p>* Our local water network is sufficient to provide the domestic water demands required to serve this development area.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the domestic foul flows arising from this development area.</p> <p>* Tywyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				flows from the domestic demands arising from this development area.	
1051	Mr Tim Singh [3195]	Map 28 - Tywyn	Object	<p>Site excluded from the Development Boundary due to the land being claimed to be within the C2 Flood Zone. Site Levels provided for the nearby and adjacent approved dwellings shows that the subject land requested to be included is set at a higher level. Thus the reasoning for exclusion of the land due to it being subject to C2 Zone status on flooding is incorrect. Estimated ground levels on Environment Agency Flood Maps which are conceded to be less accurate than actual Landform levels taken on site and referred directly to Ordnance Survey Datums.</p> <p>The Site to be included within the Development Boundary for Tywyn due to the reasoning for its exclusion of being within the C2 Zone being proven by actual Ground levels to be wholly incorrect.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the alternative site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

**SERVICE VILLAGES**

**29) Gwalchmai**

<b>Rep ID</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Section</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan</b>	<b>Comments and Recommendations</b>
1335	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T55 - Land near the A5, Gwalchmai	Support	<p>A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by a sewer and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site.</p> <p>Gwalchmai Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1413	Mari Ball [2258]	Map 29 - Gwalchmai	Object	<p>The land edged blue on the Plan has been omitted. Could you please let me know the reasons why the land edged red has not been included in the (Joint LDP)</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan’s policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 30) Newborough

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1336	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T56 - Tyn Cae Estate, Newborough	Support	This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
929	Mr Brian Owen [3108]	Map 30 - Newborough	Object	<p>Include land previously granted planning permission within Newborough Development boundary.</p> <p>a) Site is within the stopped udp boundary (PC561)</p> <p>b) Application ref 45C353 was approved</p> <p>c) 'Have your say on the Plan' leaflet states that existing land bank of 26 with an indicative additional of 14 required. is</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>this land within the existing land bank figure</p> <p>d) Windfall figure of 28 required in Newborough</p>	<p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1019	Mr Dafydd Edwards [3118]	Map 30 - Newborough	Object	<p>Land adj Bryn Felin. My client wishes to include the attached plans into the new deposit plan if possible as land available for any possible development - I do not have the policy numbers of inset map numbers to hand, is it possible to complete this section again.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1021	Mr Dafydd Edwards [3118]	Map 30 - Newborough	Object	Land adj Ael-y-Bryn. My client wishes to include the attached plans into the new deposit plan if possible as land available for any possible development - I do not have the policy numbers of inset map numbers to hand, is it possible to complete this section again.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1039	Mr Dafydd Edwards [3118]	Map 30 - Newborough	Object	Land adj Ty Lawr. My client wishes to include the attached plans into the new deposit plan if possible as land available for any possible development - I do not have the policy numbers of inset map	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				numbers to hand, is it possible to complete this section again.	<p>relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1257	Mrs Ann Evans [2781]	Map 30 - Newborough	Object	<p>Current SA Report on Cae Glas not realistic (see attached matrix) which shows it should be included within development boundary.</p> <p>The indicative housing growth predicted of 40 for Newborough is not realistic and not flexible to deal with the proposed Wylfa site which will take 10 years to construct and an estimate of 8500 staff</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies,</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>will need housing (owned or rented) for the construction phase, with various sites needed for logistics, transport spin offs. On completion of construction there will be an estimate of 1000 staff working on site.</p> <p>Cae Glas has no issues identified in the Plan and has good access links and should be accepted within the development boundary irrespective of allocation within above housing growth.</p>	<p>supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 31) Llannerch-y-medd

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
704	Mrs G Griffiths [3043]	POLICY TAI16, T57 - Land near Tyn y Ffynnon, Llannerchymedd	Support	I would like to support TAI16 (site T57). This site is suitable for development.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
718	Mrs H Thomas [3078]	POLICY TAI16, T57 - Land near Tyn y Ffynnon, Llannerchymedd	Support	We support designation T57 and are happy to offer more land if needed (SP82).	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
722	Hugh R. Jones [3079]	POLICY TAI16, T57 - Land near Tyn y Ffynnon, Llanerchymedd	Support	I support designation T57 as the land is suitable for development.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1199	Cyngor Cymdeithas Llanerchymedd (Mrs Sydna Roberts) [2881]	POLICY TAI16, T57 - Land near Tyn y Ffynnon, Llanerchymedd	Object	Llanerchymedd County Council wishes to submit the following observations: Concern regarding site T57 on the map regarding Llanerchymedd because of additional parking and traffic problems - Lack of affordable plots in the future for the young people of our area - Complex process of finding information regarding the Plan on the Internet or in the documents received from the Community Council. It would have been much easier and more cost effective to send a map of our area for consideration. - As a result of the above, finding out how to respond to the Plan was not an easy process either.	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.  Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1337	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T57 - Land near Tyn y Ffynnon, Llanerchymedd	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Llanerchymedd Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
490	M & O Roberts [2978]	Map 31 - Llanerchymedd	Object	The development boundary around Llanerchymedd has been drawn very tightly and only one housing development site has been allocated within that boundary. An overly restrictive boundary will limit significantly the prospects for much needed new	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				housing in the village. There is an opportunity to include suitable land to the west of the village, namely site SP431 on the Candidate Site register.	<p>include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
918	Mr Anthony Lewis [3102]	Map 31 - Llanerchymedd	Object	Enclosed is the LDP plan for Llannerch-y-medd. Would you please include the area shaded red on the plan. I would only require one plot for my daughter and family who would like to return to Llannerch-y-medd.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
997	Mr Hugh Owen Jones [3156]	Map 31 - Llanerchymedd	Object	I am resubmitting SP340 but have reduced its size from 0.3 3ha to 0.25ha. I hope you will give the submission due attention.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1106	Thomas Arfon Jones [2293]	Map 31 - Llanerchymedd	Object	A decision was made to object to the inclusion of SP359 into the Deposit Plan. The reason for this is Tudor Street is	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				unsuitable for a development of this site. The Community Council and I have decided to resubmit a smaller piece of land (0.5ha) which would be suitable for 5 dwellings. The road should therefore be suitable . There is water, electric and sewerage connections on site.	<p>Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1253	Frank Parry [2287]	Map 31 - Llanerchymedd	Object	According to the housing figures for Anglesey the indicative additional number required for Llanerchymedd is 22. It appears that SP82 (T57) has been allocated for affordable housing in part only would not be able to sustain the building of 22 affordable homes. But according to the site register no	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>alternative areas have been allocated. There is therefore no scope to increase the number of houses to 22 in the future.</p> <p>I would therefore like you to reconsider SP30 for the additional development required as it is in the same area as SP82 and has good access to the B5112 and is between existing housing.</p>	<p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1381	Mr /Mrs John Owen [2622]	Map 31 - Llanerchymedd	Object	<p>We wish to record our objection to SP30 land adjacent to Pendref, Llanerchymedd. In order to make a new entrance to the site trees would have to be cut down and uprooted and this should not be permitted.</p> <p>Including the site would go against highways rules and regulations, which ask for a distance from the entrance to see clearly the oncoming traffic. There is a hump in the road restricting the view of oncoming traffic from Llanerchymedd</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> SP30 has not been included in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change necessary as the site has not been included in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				and would be a major concern to road safety.	
1389	Mr Elwyn Schoffield [3306]	Map 31 - Llanerchymedd	Object	<p>It is considered that there is an over-reliance on windfall sites within the LDP. It is not considered that there is sufficient landbank within the development boundary to accommodate the identified windfall need. We wish to propose a site adjacent to Eithinog (Site SP 615) to be included within the development boundary of Llanerchymedd and allocated for housing. The site would form a reasonable extension to the development boundary to accommodate the identified housing need. The site is well integrated with and connected to the existing pattern of development along the B5111 and would sensitively infill a small gap between existing housing. The site has good connection to services and is deliverable in the short term and forms a logical infill which will deliver a modest amount of housing as frontage development onto the B5111 with a single point of access.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>



32) Bethel (Gwynedd)

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
94 & 996	Mr Steven Burgess [2699]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>We believe that the designated site T58 is too small to accommodate the number of units proposed to Bethel in the Joint LDP. We request that the site at the rear of Capel Bethel be included as a housing development site within the village in order to accommodate the future housing needs. We request that the village development boundary be extended to include this site.</p> <p>We wish to change the Joint LDP so that the site at the rear of Capel Bethel be included within the village development boundary as shown on the attached plan</p>	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b> Following another objection to T58 from the North Wales Wildlife Trust, we propose that the allocation is removed from the Plan. The site has been recognised as a Wildlife Site and following discussions with the Council's Biodiversity officers, who consider that the site is of high local biodiversity value, an alternative site to meet the settlement's demand will need to be identified in Bethel.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Delete housing allocation T58. Two alternative sites have been identified that are considered to be more suitable than the land to the rear of Capel Bethel.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF78, NF 127</b></p>
369	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>This area includes part of a local WS</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> The site has been recognised as a Wildlife Site and following discussions with the Council's Biodiversity officers, who consider that the site is of high local biodiversity value, an alternative site to meet the settlement's demand will need to be identified in Bethel.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Delete housing allocation T58. Two alternative sites have been identified, which are considered to be more suitable.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>Focussed Change NF78, NF127</b>
1230	Owen M Jones [3286]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	I object to this development, first of all because it is too large. Second of all the land is higher than the garden which will affect the privacy of my house. Third of all I anticipate that there will be a risk of flooding to the houses that back onto this land, as nearly every yard of it will be covered by concrete or tarmacadam.	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b> Following another objection to T58 from the North Wales Wildlife Trust, we propose that the allocation is removed from the Plan. The site has been recognised as a Wildlife Site and following discussions with the Council's Biodiversity officers who consider that the site is of high local biodiversity value and an alternative site meet the settlement's demand will need to be identified in Bethel.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> To delete housing allocation T58. Two alternative sites have been identified that will meet the housing needs of Bethel.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF78, NF127, NF128, NF129,</b></p>
1254	Nia Lloyd Griffith [3287]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over the boundary wall.</li> <li>Concerns over flooding if it is not meticulously prepared</li> </ol>	
1256	Hefin Evans [3288]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Economic factors - the houses currently for sale in the village are not selling.</li> <li>Environmental factors - public footpath runs through the site and history of flooding and the impact on adjoining houses. T58 is likely to exacerbate the problem.</li> </ol> <p>Both factors are essential and highlight the fact that the site is totally unsuitable. Smaller sites should be considered and sites that are less intrusive. T58 abuts too much on open countryside. Consideration must be given to sites that extend existing development and are not likely to create a detrimental environmental impact.</p>	
1391	Dr J Elwyn Hughes, MA. [3308]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>* I am unaware of any proof that there is need for further house-building in Bethel.</p> <p>* There are 'empty' plots on Stad Bro Eglwys ready for development.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b> Following an objection to T58 from the North Wales Wildlife Trust, we propose that the allocation is removed from the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>* Building more houses could attract non Welsh-speakers, thus eroding the 'old Welsh way of life', anglicizing the area, and contributing towards destroying our language and culture.</p> <p>* Adding another entrance/exit to the B4366 would create an additional flow of traffic, already comprising heavy lorries and farm vehicles, thus causing further problems and dangers on a road which is already constantly busy.</p> <p>* Any kind of development on the proposed site would affect the present unadulterated scenery.</p>	<p>Plan. The site has been recognised as a Wildlife Site and following discussions with the Council's Biodiversity officers, who consider that the site is of high local biodiversity value, an alternative site to meet the settlement's demand will need to be identified in Bethel.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> To delete housing allocation T58. Two alternative sites have been identified that will meet the housing needs of Bethel. No robust evidence was submitted to suggest amending the housing figure for Bethel.</p>
1456	Cyng/Counc Sion Jones [308]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>Discussions with residents have drawn my attention to the following:</p> <p>* Robust evidence required via a detailed study under the Council's supervision to demonstrate that drainage and sewerage problems can be overcome, particularly from the perspective of Saron's residents who are near the proposed site;</p> <p>* Full consideration needs to be given to views from nearby properties;</p> <p>* Need to ensure that Saron's residents have a new access and parking spaces in order to tackle the parking situation.</p>	<p><b>Focussed Change NF78, NF127, NF128, NF129</b></p>
1458	Dilwyn Jones [3356]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>There is no need for more housing in the village. One estate remains unfinished, that is Bro Eglwys. There are sewerage problems and the school is too small to accept more children. And what will happen to the bus stop by the gate, - a lot of people and children use this bus!</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1338	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T58 - Land near Saron, Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* The foul flows would lead to Bethel Sewage Pumping Station (SPS) and an assessment of this SPS may be needed to establish whether the flows can be accommodated or whether improvements to the SPS will be required to allow development to proceed.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1004	Mr Sam Davies [3160]	Map 32 - Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>There are no physical obstructions to developing the site and it is less visible than the designated site T58. It is better in a relatively small village to have a greater variety of sites for smaller local developers. This would be more sustainable and would improve the operational chances of the Plan to realise the spatial strategy and to provide the housing numbers. There are no negative impacts deriving from the site's Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>That site SP 282 is designated and that site T58 is reduced to accommodate approximately 20 houses.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Following an objection to T58 from the North Wales Wildlife Trust, we propose that the allocation is removed from the Plan. The site has been recognised as a Wildlife Site and following discussions with the Council's Biodiversity officers, who consider that the site is of high local biodiversity value and an alternative site to meet the settlement's demand will need to be identified in Bethel.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Delete housing allocation T58. Two alternative sites have been identified to meet the housing needs of Bethel including this site.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>Focussed Change NF78, NF127, NF128, NF129</b>
1008	Mr Dafydd Hughes [185]	Map 32 - Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>I have submitted an application for a new access into Tŷ'n Rhos; the reason is because I need to undertake work on the house, and it needs to be wide enough to bring lorries/vans and trailers up to the house.</p> <p>I have received a letter from the Council noting that I cannot build on the land of Tŷ'n Rhos. I never asked for permission to build on the land, but, as I have been given this information, I would like to know why? The Council refuses permission to build on land in the centre of the village, and then decides to build houses on the outskirts (T58). I would like to know, where is the sense in this? If I were to submit an application for building, at most, I would only permit 6 houses.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b> Following another objection to T58 from the North Wales Wildlife Trust, we propose that the allocation is removed from the Plan. The site has been recognised as a Wildlife Site and following discussions with the Council's Biodiversity officers, who consider that the site is of high local biodiversity value, an alternative site to meet the settlement's demand will need to be identified in Bethel.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Delete housing allocation T58. Two alternative sites have been identified that are considered to be more suitable than the land submitted.</p>
1009	Olwen Davies [3163]	Map 32 - Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>We support including site LS029 in the Local Development Plan. The site is ideal for development due to its location as a gap site. The land has been developed in the past with the installation of above ground sewage pipes, therefore it is currently a brownfield site, not a site in open countryside. The proposed development would comply with the Council's main policies including creating affordable housing, creating a house as high quality accommodation for tourists,</p>	<p><b>Focussed Change NF78, NF127, NF128, NF129</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>improving the environment through suitable design and using appropriate materials from the area, assisting the Welsh language and culture, energy efficiency etc.</p> <p>Include LS029 (Land at Tŷ Cerrig) in the Plan as a suitable site for development.</p>	
1189	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 32 - Bethel, Gwynedd	Support	Bethel is served by Malltraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the growth figure allocated for the catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1289	Mr Sam Davies [3160]	Map 32 - Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	<p>I would like to see the surface area of designation T58 reduced for around 20 units, and an alternative site designated opposite the Rhoslan Estate with around 20 units (site SP282).</p> <p>I object due to the fact that the site is too large for the village and more choice of sites in the village is needed to ensure that the relevant development occurs within the life of the plan. The Bro Eglwys development for 48 dwellings has commenced since 1985 and still is not complete. This shows that the market for large sites does not exist.</p> <p>The designation is not realistic therefore, given the alternative sites available that were considered in Background Paper 1A. This undermines the robustness of the plan under CE2.</p>	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b></p> <p>Following another objection to T58 from the North Wales Wildlife Trust, we propose that the allocation is removed from the Plan. The site has been recognised as a Wildlife Site and following discussions with the Council's Biodiversity officers who consider that the site is of high local biodiversity value and an alternative site meet the settlement's demand will need to be identified in Bethel.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Delete housing allocation T58. Two alternative sites have been identified that are considered to be more suitable than the land submitted.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF78, NF127, NF 128, NF129</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1457	Cyng/Counc Sion Jones [308]	Map 32 - Bethel, Gwynedd	Object	Ty Cerrig, Bethel (LS029) - I have met the owners of this land and I don't have any objections to the proposal. Therefore I would appreciate if the matter can be reconsidered.	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b> Following another objection to T58 from the North Wales Wildlife Trust, we propose that the allocation is removed from the Plan. The site has been recognised as a Wildlife Site and following discussions with the Council's Biodiversity officers, who consider that the site is of high local biodiversity value, an alternative site to meet the settlement's demand will need to be identified in Bethel.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Delete housing allocation T58. Two alternative sites have been identified that are considered to be more suitable than the land submitted.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF78, NF127, NF128, NF129</b></p>

### 33) Bontnewydd

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1339	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T59 - Land near Glanrafon Estate, Bontnewydd	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1281	Lord Newborough [3187]	POLICY TAI16, T60 - Land near Pont Glan Beuno, Bontnewydd	Support	The proposed allocation of circa 10 residential units on site T60 is supported for the following reasons:	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Deliverability - positive planning</li> <li>- Allocated housing numbers</li> <li>- Development principle</li> <li>- Opportunities and Constraints (App 1)</li> <li>- Indicative Masterplan (App 2)</li> <li>- Positive Sustainability Appraisal</li> </ul>	<b>No Change</b>
1340	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T60 - Land near Pont Glan Beuno, Bontnewydd	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</li> <li>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</li> <li>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
980	Mr Huw M Jones [3145]	Map 33 - Bontnewydd	Object	<p>Land adjacent to Pont Glan Beuno (T60) has been allocated within Bontnewydd for housing. It is not considered that this site is the best site for housing allocation to accommodate the identified housing need for Bontnewydd. We wish to propose a site at Ceirw to be included within the development boundary for Bontnewydd for allocation of housing. It is considered that the site would form a natural and modest extension to the development boundary of Bontnewydd without resulting in a sporadic intrusion into the countryside.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>We wish to seek that the land allocated for housing within Bontnewydd be reviewed and altered to include land at Ceirw.</p>	<p>The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
982	Joe Brown [3146]	Map 33 - Bontnewydd	Object	<p>To include the land within the plan as a petrol station and associated business uses along with a caravan site on the remainder of the site. The new Bontnewydd/Caernarfon road will open this land up for this use and there are no stations on the roadside for 10 miles in both direction. Suitable land for this use and no flood risk.</p> <p>Allocate land for use as a petrol station and holiday site.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 34) Botwnnog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
476	Mr Geraint Evans [2962]	POLICY TAI16, T61 - Land near Cefn Capel, Botwnnog	Support	Re: T61: Cefn Capel, Botwnnog: Agree with this potential site. Central to the village, direct access from the site either to the B4413 highway or to a quieter road before joining the B4413. A footpath already exists from this site all the way to the centre of the village to the services. Botwnnog is a village which services through two schools, a central Pen Llyn surgery, Congl y Meinciau Business Park, phone exchange etc.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1341	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T61 - Land near Cefn Capel, Botwnnog	Support	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				* Botwnnog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	
1342	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T62 - Land near Pentre, Botwnnog	Support	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991. * Botwnnog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

### 35) Chwilog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
382	WYG/Alliance Planning (Mr Mark Walton) [2905]	POLICY TAI16, T63 - Land to rear of Madryn Arms, Chwilog	Object	Delete Allocation T63 as this is now a committed Site with planning approval (April 2015) for 15 homes and allocated the adjacent land to the south for future housing.  Amend indicative growth levels to 10-30	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>housing needs of the plan area up to 2026.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural locations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site. Therefore, the proposed change is not considered necessary</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
441	WYG/Alliance Planning (Mr Mark Walton) [2905]	POLICY TAI16, T63 - Land to rear of Madryn Arms, Chwilog	Object	Extend allocation T63 to include land to the south of the proposed allocation.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion/extension of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1343	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T63 - Land to rear of Madryn Arms, Chwilog	Support	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* Off-site sewers would be required to connect to the public sewerage network. These can be provided through the sewer requisition scheme under Sections 98-101 of the Water Industry Act 1991.</p> <p>* Chwilog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1409	Admiral Taverns	POLICY TAI16, T63 -	Object	Site allocation T63 already granted	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[3348]	Land to rear of Madryn Arms, Chwilog		<p>planning permission and therefore allocation should be deleted as it no longer comprises an allocation, but a committed site. Similarly T64 is highly likely to be granted planning during 2015.</p> <p>Policy TAI (i) envisages that both allocations T63 and T64 will deliver 38 units where in fact will only bring forward 32 leaving a shortfall of 7 units. The Service Village has limited previously developed land opportunities available within the proposed development boundary and shortfall will need to be accommodated on suitable adjacent land to the development boundary. Given the two allocations will have most likely been consented in 2015 the Deposit Plan is unrealistic in assuming that the Service Village will not deliver further housing for the remainder of the plan period. Will impact on the viability of existing community facilities.</p> <p>Proposed a further allocation of land for residential use to the south of T63 which is a logical and definable boundary to the Village.</p>	<p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1410	Admiral Taverns [3348]	POLICY TAI16, T63 - Land to rear of Madryn Arms, Chwilog	Object	<p>Site allocation T63 already granted planning permission and therefore allocation should be deleted as it no longer comprises an allocation, but a committed site. Similarly T64 is highly likely to be granted planning during 2015.</p>	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Policy TAI (i) envisages that both allocations T63 and T64 will deliver 38 units where in fact will only bring forward 32 leaving a shortfall of 7 units. The Service Village has limited previously developed land opportunities available within the proposed development boundary and shortfall will need to be accommodated on suitable adjacent land to the development boundary. Given the two allocations will have most likely been consented in 2015 the Deposit Plan is unrealistic in assuming that the Service Village will not deliver further housing for the remainder of the plan period. Will impact on the viability of existing community facilities.</p> <p>Proposed a further allocation of land for residential use to the south of T63 which is a logical and definable boundary to the Village.</p>	
1348	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T64 - Land near Cae Capel, Chwilog	Support	<p>* Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by water main and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the density achievable on site.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</p> <p>* Chwilog Wastewater Treatment Works</p>	<p><b>Note the Support Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				(WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	
667	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Map 35 - Chwilog	Object	Why has a 0.7 ha GUDP site near Ty'n Rhos estate on the northern side of the village been deleted and the boundary redrawn to exclude the area? The old Afon Wen laundry site was safeguarded as a redevelopment site in the GUDP but is not included in the JLDP. A proposal for 13 houses was refused here in 2014 mainly because it was not allocated for housing. It is proposed for housing in the CSR (SP839). It is close to the main road and the new laundry premises. The site is a derelict eyesore and urgently needs redevelopment.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1023	Ms Daphne Marini [326]	Map 35 - Chwilog	Object	The current deposit plan omits approximately 1.7 acres of unused land	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				to the rear of our property (Brookside, Madryn Terrace) which is ideally suited for new build residences, community parking space (either for residents and or public in general) or light commercial development and is positioned within easy access of the centre of the village, its amenities, recreational facilities and a public transport node. Our suggested changes to the 2015 Deposit Plan align with the objectives of the Sustainability Appraisal report and would significantly support a number of the SA objectives in particular 2/3/6/7/10 whilst incurring none of the negative outcomes mentioned therein.	<p>new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1255	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Map 35 - Chwillog	Object	Why has the 0.7ha GUDP site near the Ty'n Rhos estate on the northern side of the village been deleted and the boundary redrawn to exclude the area? The old Afon Wen laundry site was safeguarded as a redevelopment site in the GUDP but not included in the JLDP. A	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				proposal for 13 houses was refused here in 2014 mainly because it was not allocated for housing. It is proposed for housing in the CSR (SP839). Although the site is well outside the Chwilog village boundary, it is close to the main road and the new laundry premises. The site is a derelict eyesore and urgently needs redevelopment. We would advocate flexible treatment in respect of its re-use.	<p>include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 36) Deiniolen

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1349	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T65 - Land near Pentre Helen, Deiniolen	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 37) Rachub

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
521	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY TAI16, T66 - Land near Maes Bleddyn, Rachub	Support	We have no objection to the site identified in Rachub (T66).	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1350	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T66 - Land near Maes Bleddyn, Rachub	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* Potential developers need to be aware that this site is crossed by a sewer and protection measures in the form of easement widths or a diversion of the pipe would be required, which may impact upon the housing density achievable on site.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Bethesda Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 38) Tremadog

- No Representations

### 39) Y Ffôr

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1344	Cyngor Cymuned Llannor (Mr Haydn	POLICY TAI16, T67 - Land near Tyn Lôn, Y	Object	If application C14/0999/40/LL is successful, there is no need to include	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Jones) [1549]	Ffor		T67 in the plan.	<p>new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1351	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T67 - Land near Tyn Lôn, Y Ffor	Object	<p>* A water supply can be provided to serve this site.</p> <p>* The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site.</p> <p>* The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				improvements at Y Ffor Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>No Change</b>
1181	Cyngor Cymuned Llannor (Mr Haydn Jones) [1549]	POLICY TAI16, T68 - Land near the School, Y Ffor	Object	<p>The location of T68, the current site for Ysgol Hafod Lon has been included in the deposit plan. The members do not support this. In a public meeting that was organised many years ago by Gwynedd Council, it was agreed that consideration would be given to using the site as a car park for the village of Y Ffor.</p> <p>The members would like to see T68 removed from the plan.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks a deletion of a site within the Deposit Plan. In preparing the Deposit Plan, the JPPU collated an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period and has also identified the necessary infrastructure required to support the development. The sites allocated within the plan are consistent with the overall plan Strategy and are deliverable within the plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing needs of the plan area up to 2026. Furthermore, the Deposit Plan contains a suite of policies and supporting text that explains how development will be managed within the areas of change, and the mechanisms by which the necessary infrastructure, services and facilities will be secured. This policy framework also includes the Councils' requirement to mitigate potential impacts of development in relation to enhancing and protecting the natural and built environment, provision of sustainable transport, community facilities, environmental assets and the careful management of development in environmentally sensitive areas or rural</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					locations.  <b>Recommendation</b>  It is considered that the JLDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for the removal of the site.  <b>No Change</b>
1352	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T68 - Land near the School, Y Ffor	Object	* A water supply can be provided to serve this site. * The public sewerage network can accept the potential foul flows from the proposed development site. * The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Y Ffor Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1353	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	POLICY TAI16, T69 - Land near Bro Gwystil, Y Ffor	Support	* This site has planning permission as such we have no further comment to make.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
720	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Map 39 - Y Ffôr	Object	We support development of housing and employment sites on suitable sites in the Service Village of Y Ffôr. The settlement offers scope for expansion as a self-contained residential and employment centre within easy access of the urban services of Pwllheli. We support the two housing land proposals T67 and T68, as	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				well as C10 which is proposed for employment land. We note that the housing site near Hafod Lôn has been deleted, We do not see the logic of this and would argue for reinstatement and use of this site for housing.	<p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The inclusion of the alternative site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p>
721	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Map 39 - Y Ffôr	Object	We support development of housing and employment sites on suitable sites in the Service Village of Y Ffôr. The settlement offers scope for expansion as a self-contained residential and employment centre within easy access of the urban services of Pwllheli. We support the two housing land proposals T67 and T68, as well as C10 which is proposed for employment land. We note that the housing site near Hafod Lôn has been deleted, We do not see the logic of this and would argue for reinstatement and use of this site for housing.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1037	Lord Newborough [3187]	Map 39 - Y Ffôr	Object	<p>The proposed allocation of circa 18 residential units on Site T67 (Land near Tyn Lôn) Y Ffôr is supported for the following reasons:            Deliverability - Positive Planning.            Allocated Housing Numbers            Development Principle            Opportunities and Constraints - As attached at Appendix 1            Indicative Masterplan - As attached at Appendix 2            Positive Sustainability Appraisal</p> <p>An additional site opposite Site T68 (land near the School) has also been put forward for consideration as indicated on the Opportunities and Constraints Plan. A Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out and is included in the supporting documentation.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1038	Cyngor Cymuned Llannor (Mr Haydn Jones) [1549]	Map 39 - Y Ffôr	Object	<p>The Plan provides an indicative figure that 40 houses are needed in Ffôr between 2011 and 2026. Planning permission has already been granted for nine houses which reduces the need to 31 houses.</p> <p>Planning application C14/0999/40LI has been submitted (but not determined) on the site for 40 houses. Land is in the previous Plan and the Community Council is concerned that it is not included in the new plan. The Community Council supports this application. It does not support location T68.</p> <p>Include the site of planning application C14/0999 in the new deposit plan.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.  <b>No Change</b>
1116	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Map 39 - Y Ffôr	Object	We note that the GUDP housing site near Hafod Lôn has been deleted from the GUDP, although it is the subject of a pending outline application for 40 housing units (C14/0999/40/AM), while the proposed village development boundary has been redrawn to exclude this area. We do not see the logic of this and would argue for reinstatement and use of this site for housing.	<b>Not Accepted</b> The representation seeks the inclusion of a new site not included within the Deposit Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy, the JLDP provision, and other relevant material factors, it is considered that there is no demonstrable need to include the site within the Plan.  Furthermore, the Plan's policies, supporting text and documentation have set out how the Council proposes to manage the delivery of new development including details on infrastructure planning. The LDP therefore demonstrates how development can be managed, phased and impacts mitigated. It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach such as a new settlement or the suggested alternative site to deliver the identified housing and employment needs.  <b>Recommendation</b> The inclusion of the site is therefore not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the JLDP.  <b>No Change</b>

## LOCAL VILLAGES

### 40) Bethel (Anglesey)

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
914	Ceri Pritchard [3098]	Map 40 - Bethel (Ynys Môn)	Object	<p>To extend Bethel's development boundary to include land shown on attached map to allow a dwelling for a local person.</p> <p>The site is located on a former quarry and is classified as brownfield land.</p> <p>The site can be accessed from the main road.</p> <p>The site itself is level, not at risk of flooding or surface water problems.</p> <p>Development of the site would not lead to a loss of trees and hedgerows.</p> <p>Utilities are directly on site.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1396	Iolo Owen & Co [2237]	Map 40 - Bethel (Ynys Môn)	Object	<p>My client wishes to include the attached plans into the new deposit plan if possible as land available for any possible development.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 41) Bodffordd

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
933	Iolo Owen & Co [2237]	Map 41 - Bodffordd	Object	My client wishes to include the attached plans into the new deposit plan if possible as land available for any possible development	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
934	Iolo Owen & Co [2237]	Map 41 - Bodffordd	Object	My client wishes to include the attached plans into the new deposit plan if possible as land available for any possible development	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1190	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 41 - Bodffordd	Object	The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Bodffordd Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 42) Bryngwran

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
935	Mr Gwyn Williams [3119]	Map 42 – Bryngwran	Object	<p>The site in question already has planning approval for one plot (given on appeal APP/L6805/A/2195898 20/09/13). The inspector deemed the site suitable for an infill site within the village of Bryngwran.</p> <p>We wish you to look favourably for one more building plot on this site.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1191	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 42 - Bryngwran	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Bryngwran as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 43) Brynsiencyn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
386	Mrs Rosamund James [2726]	Map 43 - Brynsiencyn	Object	<p>I am objecting to the proposed inclusion within the Brynsiencyn village boundary of the field bounded by properties in Lôn Uchaf and Ty'n y Bryn. I am objecting on the grounds that this is prime, agricultural land that is currently in use for grazing and free-range poultry. There are other sites available for potential housing development that are currently neither used nor maintained.</p> <p>I am also objecting on grounds of increased traffic, insufficient capacity in the sewerage system, adverse effect on wildlife, and basic lack of facilities within the village to support current population, never mind an increase.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Development boundaries have been drawn around villages to ensure sufficient opportunities exist for settlements within the plan. The suitability or otherwise of parcels of land within a development boundary will be considered at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Land at Merddyn Gwyn has had the benefit of planning permission for a number of years but has not been developed to date. In the 2014 Joint Housing Land Availability Study this site was outside the 5 year land supply due to the length of time it has had permission. In fact Table 3 in Appendix 5 of the Deposit Plan identifies a number of units from the land bank which are unlikely to be completed and the 13 for Brynsiencyn are the Merddyn Gwyn site.</p>
1405	Mr Dave Shone [3347]	Map 43 - Brynsiencyn	Object	<p>Objecting on the grounds that this is prime, agricultural land. There are other non-agricultural sites available? I refer specifically to land at Ty'n y Cwrt/Merddyn Gwyn</p> <p>Other considerations are that it would bring an unwelcome increase in traffic and I have it on authority that the present sewerage system is near capacity and might not be able to cope with any further load.</p> <p>Also objecting to this proposal on environmental grounds. It would also destroy the open aspect currently enjoyed by local residents. An increase in intensive urbanization of Brynsiencyn will</p>	<p>The Highways Dept has not objected to the settlement's development boundary.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				ultimately result in the loss of village character.  I would like the field bounded by properties in Lôn Uchaf and Ty'n y Bryn to remain outside the village boundary, so that it can't be used for building development.	
924	Cyngor Cymuned Llanidan (Mr ME Jones) [1392]	Map 43 - Brynsiencyn	Object	Remove filed marked A on the map from the development boundary: i) We believe that the sewerage treatment works would not be able to cope with the development ii) Access to the field is poor because it would lead to traffic going through existing estates to reach the site.  As a way forward the Community Council would like to see the filed marked B on the map included within the development boundary because this site benefits from existing planning permission.	
1192	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 43 - Brynsiencyn	Support	Brynsiencyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 44) Caergeiliog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
--------	------	---------	------	-----------------------------------------------	------------------------------

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1110	Mr HR Michael [3232]	Map 44 - Caergeiliog	Object	<p>I object to the plan on the basis that the development boundary for Caergeiliog should include my alternative site.</p> <p>The site is located in the centre of the village opposite a housing estate which means that infrastructure such as sewerage and water and electricity supply are located convenient to the site.</p> <p>A lack of affordable housing exists in the settlement and I note from the document that more houses are required and I believe that it is essentially important in terms of sustainable Welsh communities that the provision of affordable houses is sufficient for the needs of local people who want to remain in their localities.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1117	Mr Selwyn Owen [3233]	Map 44 - Caergeiliog	Object	<p>The development boundary for Caergeiliog, which currently excludes this site, should be amended to include it and the land should be designated as a housing allocation with planning permission to correctly reflect the land's status as a committed site for development of 69 dwellings and 4 flats.</p> <p>In Appendix 5, the removal of the reference to 73 units in Caergeiliog in the table of sites within Ynys Môn which are unlikely to be developed during the Plan period.</p> <p>The addition of these 73 units into the</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The Deposit Plan recognises a hierarchy of towns and villages which have a specific role and function. Within Topic Paper 5 – Developing the Settlement Strategy a methodology was developed and published to recognise these settlements on the basis of their role, function, range of facilities and services.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is targeted to locations which are sustainable in terms of size, role, character, facilities, transport links, social inclusion and environment. Therefore, there will be a sustainable pattern of</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				figure for the number of units with permission in the villages section of table 18 and a corresponding reduction in the figure for the additional number of dwelling unites required.	<p>communities which have a viable community.</p> <p>Distributing further growth to villages and clusters beyond what has currently been recognised in Policy PS15 without robust evidence to do so would undermine the spatial strategy and the sustainability principles which the Plan is based upon.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1193	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 44 - Caergeiliog	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<p><b>Comment Noted</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> The Councils will continue to have ongoing discussions with DCWW on the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1194	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 44 - Caergeiliog	Support	Caergeiliog is served by Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 45) Dwyran

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1195	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 45 - Dwyran	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1196	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 45 - Dwyran	Support	Dwyran is served by Newborough Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 46) Llandegfan

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1197	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 46 - Llandegfan	Support	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	
1198	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 46 - Llandegfan	Object	The total growth being promoted within the catchment area of Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) would necessitate improvements to the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1797	Mrs Mary Davidson [3359]	Map 46 - Llandegfan	Object	<p>Land should be allocated for housing to accommodate the identified housing need.</p> <p>We wish to seek that our site adjacent to Gwel y Llan Estate should be included within the development boundary of Llandegfan and allocated for housing.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> The Deposit Plan recognises a hierarchy of towns and villages which have a specific role and function. Within Topic Paper 5 – Developing the Settlement Strategy a methodology was developed and published to recognise these settlements on the basis of their role, function, range of facilities and services.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is targeted to locations which are sustainable in terms of size, role, character, facilities, transport links, social inclusion and environment. Therefore, there will be a sustainable pattern of communities which have a viable community.</p> <p>Distributing further growth to villages and clusters beyond what has currently been</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>recognised in Policy PS15 without robust evidence to do so would undermine the spatial strategy and the sustainability principles which the Plan is based upon.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 47) Llanddaniel Fab

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
967	Carolyn Watcyn [2216]	Map 47 - Llanddaniel Fab	Object	Please include my land in the Joint Local Development Plan for reasons shown on the attachments.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
968	W G Davies [2218]	Map 47 - Llanddaniel Fab	Object	<p>1) Llanddaniel is a local village listed in table 20 and is therefore under policy TAI17</p> <p>2) The site shown on the candidate site</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>register attached is in the village boundary and is considered to meet criteria in TAI17</p> <p>3) Current proposals to extend Ysgol Parc y Bont and the creation of a science park in nearby Gaerwen will increase the demand for local homes. The provision therefore requires amendment.</p> <p>Include site SP769 in the new Local Development Plan.</p>	<p>the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
991	W G Davies [2218]	Map 47 - Llanddaniel Fab	Object	<p>1) Llanddaniel is listed in table 20 as a local village and is therefore under policy TAI17.</p> <p>2) The sites shown on the candidate sites register attached are infill sites within the village area which will meet the criteria in TAI17</p> <p>3) Current proposals to amalgamate Ysgol Parc y Bont and Llangaffo, the demand by local welsh families will increase, thus provision requires amendment.</p> <p>Include the parcels of land (identified as SP123 on the Candidate Site Register) in the new Local Development Plan.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1202	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 47 - Llanddaniel Fab	Support	<p>Llanddaniel Fab is served by Gaerwen Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 48) Llanfachraeth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1203	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 48 - Llanfachraeth	Support	Llanfachraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 49) Llanfaethlu

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
920	Mr Tom Carpenter [2863]	Map 49 - Llanfaethlu	Object	We wish to object to the Deposit Local Development Plan's boundary for Llanfaethlu. The inclusion of the land to the north of Bryn Llwyd Estate would ensure that Llanfaethlu could accommodate the new area primary school together with additional housing ensuring that the level of housing is maintained over the plan period. The site is within a sustainable location alongside the A5025, a key public transport route which will link the village with the planning Wylfa Newydd Nuclear Power Station and also with the larger settlements of Holyhead and Valley to the west where there are accessible links to the national public transport network via the mainline railway stations.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1204	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 49 - Llanfaethlu	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Llanfaethlu as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				units and the existing landbank.	No Change

#### 50) Llanfechell

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1205	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 50 - Llanfechell	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1206	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 50 - Llanfechell	Support	Llanfechell Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 51) Llanfihangel yn Nhowyn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1207	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 51 - Llanfihangel yn Nhowyn	Support	Llanfihangael yn Nhowyn is served by Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>No Change</b>

## 52) Llangaffo

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1208	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 52 - Llangaffo	Object	The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Llangaffo Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 53) Llangristiolus

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
921	Muriel Williams [2075]	Map 53 - Llangristiolus	Object	<p>Extend the development boundary to include the land marked in red in the map.</p> <p>There should be a choice of housing needs ion local villages which recognises the housing needs of all. TAI17 currently conflicts with the wider aims and objectives of PPW with respect to housing in rural areas.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				It is difficult to reconcile the draft JLDP's narrowly defined housing strategy. The policy will prove unrealistic in fulfilling its objectives and is not reasonably flexible to deal with the changing circumstances which are currently faced by Anglesey as opposed to Gwynedd.	not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>
1007	Mr & Mrs D.R. & K.M. Jones [3161]	Map 53 - Llangristiolus	Object	Building housing will provide work for local tradesmen and trade for local merchandisers. The site had planning permission granted for housing 29/07/1970 no A/1369a which has lapsed.	<b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.  <b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>
1209	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 53 - Llangristiolus	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Llangristiolus as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>

#### 54) Llanrhyddlad

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1210	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 54 - Llanrhyddlad	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Llanrhyddlad as the indicative housing growth is provided for by the existing landbank.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 55) Pencarnisiog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
76	Michael D Whitehead [2724]	Map 55 - Pencarnisiog	Support	<p>Confirm support subject to correct interpretation-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Planning applications must conform to all points of TAI17.</li> <li>* Development is restricted to within outline boundaries (map 55)</li> <li>* Preference is given to Sustainable living SO5 - whilst respecting the varied role and character of the centres, villages and countryside.</li> <li>* Preference is given to protect and enhance the natural and built environment SO16 - Protect, enhance and manage the natural and heritage assets of the Plan area, including its natural resources, wildlife habitats, and its landscape character.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
632	Mr Martin Singleton [3044]				
636	Mr Geraint Simpson [3046]				
639	Ms Kerris Singleton [3053]				
643	Myfanwy Williams [3054]				
646	Trevor Roberts [3042]				
650	Tina Raistrick [3055]				
652	Ms Gwion Llyn Williams [3056]				
655	Mr Dennis Whitehead [3057]				
663	A.E. Stewart [3063]				
666	Dr Medwyn Williams [3064]				
	Miss Siwan Mair				

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
668 670 684 710 715 724 725 745 746 747	Williams [3065] Susan Nason [3066] A.M. Nason [3067] Dorothy Whitehead [3076] Nerys F. Owen [3077] Mr T.H. Jones [3080] Mrs J Jones [3082] Margaret E.P. Roberts [3085] Wyn Owen [3086] Elen Wyn Simpson [3088]				
1211	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 55 - Pencarnisiog	Support	Pencaernisiog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figures for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 56) Penysarn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1212	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 56 - Penysarn	Support	Penysarn is served by Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 57) Rhosybol

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1213	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 57 - Rhosybol	Support	Rhosybol is served by Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

### 58) Talwrn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
992	Mr Emlyn Williams [40]	Map 58 - Talwrn	Object	I would like to include my land in the development boundary for the following reasons: - access - adjacent to development boundary - suitability - flat / dry land - walking distance to Talwrn school - walking distance to bus route - active community with village hall where groups are held	<b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.  <b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>
993	Mr Emlyn Williams [40]	Map 58 - Talwrn	Object	I would like to include my land in the development boundary for the following reasons: - access - adjacent to development boundary - suitability - flat / dry land - walking distance to Talwrn school - walking distance to bus route	<b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.  <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				- active community with village hall where groups are held	Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>
1214	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 58 - Talwrn	Support	Talwrn is served by Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from these growth figure allocated for the catchment area	<b>Note the Support Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 59) Tregele

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1215	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 59 - Tregele	Object	Tregele is served by Cemaes Bay Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement may require improvements to the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>

#### 60) Abererch

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
717	Council for the Protection of Rural	Map 60 - Abererch	Object	Why has a 0.9 ha area allocated for housing in the GUDP near Ty Gwyn on	<b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]			the south side of the village been deleted and the village boundary redrawn?	<p>identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1231	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 60 - Abererch	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1232	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 60 - Abererch	Object	The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Abererch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 61) Brynrefail

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
919	Mr Hefin Williams [3103]	Map 61 - Brynrefail	Object	<p>In order to provide housing choice, allow for increased flexibility and for the sustainability of existing services the target housing figure for the village of Brynrefail should be increased by a further 8 units and brownfield site identified on the attached plan should be included within the settlement boundary.</p> <p>Amend table 20 to allow for 15 residential units as the indicative growth level of Brynrefail.</p> <p>Amend the settlement boundary of Brynrefail to include the proposed site within the settlement.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1233	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 61 - Brynrefail	Support	<p>Deiniolen Brynrefail Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 62) Caeathro

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
983	Cyng/Counc Eurig Wyn [364]	Map 62 - Caeathro	Object	<p>I am aware that permission has been granted to construct 19 houses for the field that lies across the road from Gwalia Garage. Is this development going to proceed?</p> <p>If it is, I would want assurance that the appropriate proportion of affordable houses would be part of the development. I believe that in certain circumstances the quota of affordable housing should be increased. Hopefully the plan will consider this.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The Deposit Plan recognises a hierarchy of towns and villages which have a specific role and function. Within Topic Paper 5 – Developing the Settlement Strategy a methodology was developed and published to recognise these settlements on the basis of their role, function, range of facilities and services.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is targeted to locations which are sustainable in terms of size, role, character, facilities, transport links, social inclusion and environment. Therefore, there will be a sustainable pattern of communities which have a viable community.</p> <p>Distributing further growth to villages and clusters beyond what has currently been recognised in Policy PS15 without robust evidence to do so would undermine the spatial strategy and the sustainability principles which the Plan is based upon.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1234	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi)	Map 62 - Caeathro	Object	Caeathro is served by Caernarfon Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW).	<p><b>Comments Noted</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>

### 63) Carmel

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1235	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 63 - Carmel	Object	Carmel is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
484	Miss Nia Morris [2972]	Map 63 - Carmel	Object	The village of Carmel is defined as a cluster settlement however, the boundary of the cluster omits parts of the village which are very much part of the village fabric. There appears to be no logical reason for this. It is important that the village has an opportunity to expand and to regenerate and there must be opportunities provided for that to take place. There are development	<b>Not Accepted</b> Responder has mistaken Carmel, Anglesey for Carmel Gwynedd.  It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				opportunities available including site ref SP91 on the Candidate Site register, which is a suitable site largely surrounded by built development. Such a site can make a positive contribution to the village.	<p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 64) Cwm y Glo

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1236	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 64 - Cwm y Glo	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Cwm y Glo as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 65) Dinas (Llanwnda)

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1237	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 65 - Dinas (Llanwnda)	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Dinas as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 66) Dinas Dinlle

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1238	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 66 - Dinas Dinlle	Object	Dinas Dinlle is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 67) Dolydd a Maen Coch

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1239	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 67 - Dolydd & Maen Coch	Object	Dolydd a Maen Coch is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 68) Efailnewydd

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
961	Megan Jones [3131]	Map 68 - Efailnewydd	Object	Since the Parc yr Efail estate has been established, 12 houses have been built on the land with local families residing in every house up to now. The fact that these houses were sold so effortlessly	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>together with a varying waiting list proves the need for sustainable housing in Efailnewydd.</p> <p>A local survey discovered that 12 were in need of moving. Designation of 6 (LDP) is low compared to the need that was found in the survey.</p> <p>Ideal site to build houses with services nearby.</p>	<p>required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
963	Megan Jones [3131]	Map 68 - Efailnewydd	Object	<p>Since the Parc yr Efail estate has been established, 12 houses have been built on the land with local families residing in every house up to now. The fact that these houses were sold so effortlessly together with a varying waiting list proves the need for sustainable housing in Efailnewydd.</p> <p>A local survey discovered that 12 were in need of moving. Designation of 6 (LDP) is low compared to the need that was found in the survey.</p> <p>Ideal site to build houses with services nearby.</p> <p>10 of the 12 are Welsh speakers who cannot afford housing on the open market and not enough available houses to let or buy locally. Result - move to an unfamiliar area away from their family and friends</p> <p>Enquiries by local Welsh speakers looking for open market plots.</p> <p>Extend the current boundary to include part of land near Parc yr Efail.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
966	Dr B Hughes-Parry	Map 68 - Efailnewydd	Object	Alteration of the proposed development	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[3132]			boundary for Efailnewydd (Map Inset 68) to include Land at Penllwyn to provide for a deliverable site on the edge of the settlement boundary suitable for residential development of circa 6 dwellings. Objection to the restriction of growth in Efailnewydd to 8 windfall dwellings over the plan period and the drawing of the development boundary. Objection to the sustainability assessment for Efailnewydd (settlement score). The current approach actually puts at risk the viability of local services.	It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.  <b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>
1240	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 68 - Efailnewydd	Support	Efailnewydd Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 69) Garndolbenmaen

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1241	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 69 - Garndolbenmaen	Support	The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Garndolbenmaen Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

## 70) Garreg-Llanfrothen

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1242	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 70 - Garreg-Llanfrothen	Support	Llanfrothen Garreg Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 71) Groeslon

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
922	Mr Kenneth Pitts [3104]	Map 71 - Groeslon	Object	<p>My request is that the village boundary be extended to include the field as indicated on the enclosed map.</p> <p>On checking the plan of the village boundary there does not appear to be any other suitable sites for building. My field is landlocked and is only occasionally by horses to keep the grass down.</p> <p>my proposal is to be able to build a bungalow alongside the existing house (for our own private use). Access could be gained via the gate leading to the field. The remaining parcel of land could be used as further development and access could be gained along the existing driveway to the main house. According to the indicative plan 11 houses are required in the village, a percentage of your quota might be achieved by</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>developing this land.</p> <p>This site is particularly suitable for development due to easy access to all services.</p>	
1228	Mr Eurwyn Jones [2884]	Map 71 - Groeslon	Object	<p>Please include SP71 in the Development Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site was one of the four sites proposed for the new Primary School.</li> <li>- It has good access to the highway.</li> <li>- Has the potential of creating more local housing in the village of Groeslon.</li> <li>- Attracting more people of working age and their children into the community to support school.</li> <li>- Reduce outmigration of working age people and families enabling young people to remain in village via affordable housing.</li> <li>- Safeguard the Welsh language.</li> <li>- Promote community interaction and social inclusion.</li> <li>- Opposite Lôn Arfon providing opportunity for healthier lifestyles.</li> </ul> <p>-</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1243	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 71 - Groeslon	Object	<p>Groeslon is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				developer contributions.	<b>No Change</b>

## 72) Llandwrog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1244	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 72 - Llandwrog	Object	Llandwrog is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 73) Llandygai

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
923	Mr B Carter [3105]	Map 73 - Llandygai	Object	<p>We wish to object to the exclusion of land at Hewden's Plant Hire and the adjacent warehouse from the development boundary of Llandygai as it is considered that the exclusion of this substantial previously developed land is contrary the advice contained within Planning Policy Wales.</p> <p>We wish for the sites to be included within the development boundary of</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Llandygai.	soundness of the Plan. <b>No Change</b>
1245	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 73 - Llandygai	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Llandygai as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

#### 74) Llangybi

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1246	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 74 - Llangybi	Support	Llangybi Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

#### 75) Llanllyfni

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1247	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 75 - Llanllyfni	Support	Llanllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

#### 76) Llanystumdwy

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1248	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 76 - Llanystumdwy	Support	Llanystumdwy Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 77) Nantlle

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
928	Mrs Vera Jones [3113]	Map 77 - Nantlle	Object	<p>A stream springs from the Pen yr Orsedd quarry and then under the land at Tŷ Mawr and Sycharth. Comes out as a stream on land in the south and into the 'mud'. Risk of pollution and an impact on the balance of the area's wildlife. Risk of flooding to developments given the local history of floods in the Barics.</p> <p>Move the boundary closer to the houses (perhaps to where it was originally) to ensure that there will be no building on the land. To ensure that there will be enough suitable land to permit housing developments in Nantlle, the proposed development boundary to the south of Swyn Nant should be expanded to be a 60m boundary which abuts Sycharth. Here, there would be no risk of an impact on nature and wildlife or the possibility of creating unnecessary pollution. By giving more room here it is believed that there would also be less traffic encroaching on</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				the centre of Nantlle village.	
1249	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 77 - Nantlle	Support	Nantlle is served by Llanllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1290	Cyng/Counc Craig ab Iago [347]	Map 77 - Nantlle	Object	<p>Proposal moves the village's boundary to the west in order to provide land for 6 new houses that are part of the LDP.</p> <p>I foresee several problems with this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A public footpath runs through the middle of the site</li> <li>- A stream runs through the middle of the site which comes off the quarry and has created a long list of problems for the barracks</li> <li>- The site has no obvious entrance</li> </ul> <p>The best option is to extend the boundary down the main road to the right (SP430). The land is dryer, has access from the main road and there is no public footpath. More importantly, local people with children wish to build houses on it.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 78) Penisarwaun

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1250	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	Map 78 - Penisarwaun	Support	Pensairwaun Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1386	Cyngor Cymuned Llanddeiniolen (Ms Eleri Bean) [1531]	Map 78 - Penisarwaun	Object	<p>As land to build houses upon is scarce in the Penisarwaun area, we would like to make an application to slightly extend the development boundary, permitting the construction of one or two houses in some areas that abut the current development boundary - See numbers 1, 2, 3 and 4 in the included map. There are several young people who live in the area at present with their parents, or who have had to leave to have a house to live in, who are very eager to settle down in Penisarwaun.</p> <p>The deposit plan as it currently stands does not permit the construction of enough housing to meet the demand in Penisarwaun.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 79) Pentref Uchaf

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1251	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 79 - Pentref Uchaf	Support	Pentre Uchaf Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

## 80) Rhiwlas

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
998	Robert Harrison [3158]	Map 80 - Rhiwlas	Object	<p>The land is located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary and has an existing access road. There are no international, national or local biodiversity designations or designated heritage assets within or adjacent to the site. Approximately half of the proposed site is adjacent to the existing village boundary and therefore would not be viewed as encroachment into open countryside and would integrate with the built form of a settlement. The site is not within a flood risk area.</p> <p>Hoped that housing on the site will have positive effects to promote social inclusion and community cohesion. Lack of potential new building land within the existing village boundary, and site could provide low cost affordable local needs housing which in turn could benefit the local school.</p> <p>I wish to submit a proposal for a new site to be added that lies outside the existing village boundary of Rhiwlas, Gwynedd, North Wales.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1252	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 80 - Rhiwlas	Support	<p>Rhiwlas Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 81) Rhosgadfan

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1306	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 81 - Rhosgadfan	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1307	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 81 - Rhosgadfan	Object	Rhosgadfan is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

## 82) Rhostryfan

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
946	Delyth Owen [3122]	Map 82 - Rhostryfan	Object	I would like to request a change to the deposit plan (82 Rhostryfan). To include the land outlined in red in the enclosed copy of the deposit plan. I believe that before the plan was	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>changed that this piece of land was within the village boundary, as I was told previously by a representative of the planning office in Caernarfon to go in for full planning as outlined planning wasn't needed.</p> <p>The land in question is surrounded by houses on all sides, with no access problems.</p> <p>To add the land marked red to be included in the village boundary.</p>	<p>required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1308	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 82 - Rhostryfan	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Rhostryfan as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 83) Sarn Mellteyrn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1309	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 83 - Sarn Mellteyrn	Support	Sarn Mellteyrn Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 84) Talysarn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
553	Cyngor Cymuned	Map 84 - Talysarn	Object	Object to the size of the land (SP860) in	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Llanllyfni (Mrs Alwen Johnson) [2835]			<p>question for the use of a small village such as Talysarn.</p> <p>Of course building land is needed in the Village, but if the plan is adopted in its current form, it will change the character of the village and will adversely affect the language, noise level and will also add to traffic on the streets which are already too narrow and dangerous for existing traffic.</p>	<p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1261	Gareth Lloyd Jones [3171]	Map 84 - Talysarn	Object	<p>I wish for the land identified as SP860 to be taken out of the development plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The fact that there is a covenant preventing the change of use of a section of the land.</li> <li>2. Any development on this land will have a detrimental effect on the privacy and amenities of the properties surrounding it.</li> <li>3. Any subsequent proposals for developing the land, if included within the new LDP would be in contradiction to a number of the Council's own planning policies.</li> <li>4. A brownfield site, already located within the current UDP area has been refused planning permission for its clearance for development twice since 2007. This being in contradiction of Council planning policy C3.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1310	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 84 - Talysarn	Support	Talysarn is served by Llanllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 85) Trefor

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1313	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 85 - Trefor	Support	Trefor Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 86) Tregarth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1010	MWJ Properties Ltd (Mark Jones) [3165]	Map 86 - Tregarth	Object	<p>Would be grateful if you would consider the land edged red on the plan attached as a housing designation within the proposed Gwynedd and Mon Local Plan, for the following reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Closely follows the development boundary for Tregarth;</li> <li>* Used to alleviate the housing pressure within larger towns of Bethesda and Bangor;</li> <li>* Junction onto B4409 has sufficient</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				capacity for sustainable housing development * In a position to provide planning, highway and amenity gains.	<b>No Change</b>
1270	Mr mark richards [2907]	Map 86 - Tregarth	Object	<p>A large % of the community at Craig y Pandy and Waen y Pandy Tregarth wish to object to the inclusion of land that covers our two streets.</p> <p>We feel it would make our area less safe for residents, an increase in traffic, the infrastructure in not suitable, effects on biodiversity and affect the living conditions of adjacent occupiers.</p> <p>There are no village services and a diminishing public transport service.</p> <p>In previous consultations the council was of the opinion that "the land at Craig y Pandy and Waun y Pandy is unsuitable to be included within the development boundary and/or allocated for housing".</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1311	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 86 - Tregarth	Object	<p>There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	
1312	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 86 - Tregarth	Support	Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 87) Tudweiliog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1314	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 87 - Tudweiliog	Support	Tudweiliog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 88) Waunfawr

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
949	Jason Anderson [3123]	Map 88 - Waunfawr	Object	I wish to make a representation to include the site 'Cae Top Frondeg' for inclusion for the development of housing within the Anglesey and Gwynedd Deposit Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026. I feel that the current proposed development boundary around this site does not take into account the natural and historical boundary of the village and also the fact that this site is situated between 3 residential properties	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				and the road making it suitable for inclusion within the boundary as windfall/infill site. The site is not green belt, has never been agricultural use, also there has also been development of an area only 25 metres away also outside the boundary into hard standing car park for Antur Waunfawr, this shows that there is scope for development. I request that this site is included within the boundary as windfall/infill site.	soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>
1298	Cyng/Counc Eurig Wyn [364]	Map 88 - Waunfawr	Object	<p>The field opposite Snowdonia Fire has not been included within the development boundary even though there are plans to developed a surgery and football field on the site.</p> <p>I would like to see the field included within the village's development boundary. There is an agreement between the Betsi Cadwaladr Health Board and the village surgery that this is the location for the new village surgery. There is also an informal agreement that a football field will be located to the rear of the new surgery.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1315	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 88 - Waunfawr	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Waunfawr as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 89) Y Fron

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1316	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 89 - Y Fron	Support	Y Fron is served by Llanllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### COASTAL / RURAL VILLAGES

### 90) Aberffraw

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1216	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 90 - Aberffraw	Support	Aberffraw Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 91) Carreglefn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1217	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 91 - Carreglefn	Object	Carreglefn does not have public sewerage facilities therefore the provisions of Circular 10/99 'Planning Requirement in respect of the Use of Non-Mains Sewerage incorporating Septic Tanks in New Development' apply and consultation with Natural Resources	<p><b>Comments Noted</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the matters raised.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				Wales will be required.	<b>No Change</b>

## 92) Llanbedrgoch

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1108	Mr Greg Donald [3230]	Map 92 - Llanbedrgoch	Object	The land hatched in red on the attached plan we feel should be considered for development in the future as Llanbedrgoch is an established village and needs to grow in order to sustain the village community.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1219	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 92 - Llanbedrgoch	Object	Llanbedrgoch does not have public sewerage facilities therefore the provisions of Circular 10/99 'Planning Requirement in respect of the Use of Non-Mains Sewerage incorporating Septic Tanks in New Development' apply and consultation with Natural Resources Wales will be required	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 93) Llanddona

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1220	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 93 - Llanddona	Support	Llanddona is served by Llangoed Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 94) Llanfaelog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1221	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 94 - Llanfaelog	Object	Llanfaelog is served by Rhosneigr Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

### 95) Llangoed

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1222	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 95 - Llangoed	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1223	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 95 - Llangoed	Support	Llangoed Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 96) Malltraeth

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1224	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 96 - Malltraeth	Support	Malltraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### 97) Moelfre

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
480	Mr B Pritchard [2951]	Map 97 - Moelfre	Object	The development boundary around the village of Moelfre has been drawn very tightly and in a manner that will limit the prospect of any new housing development in an overly restrictive way. There are opportunities to develop small	<b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				infill sites within the existing built form of the village but outside the defined boundary. Land to the west of the village, specifically part of the site referred to as SP164 on the Candidate Site register can offer such a solution. The Plan identifies limited housing growth for Moelfre but is not clear as to where such sites will be found.	plan. <b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan. <b>No Change</b>
1158	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	Map 97 - Moelfre	Object	Land adj Ystant Nant Bychan, Moelfre. Moelfre should be included as a Local Service Centre under Policy TAI15. It is considered that there is an over-reliance on windfall sites within the Local Development Plan. Land should be allocated for housing to accommodate the identified housing need. It is considered that only allowing local market housing and affordable housing within Moelfre will weaken the community, resulting in an increase in deprivation and will threaten the sustainability of the settlement. We propose a site adjacent to Ystad Nant Bychan to be included within the development boundary for housing.	<b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan. <b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan. <b>No Change</b>
1225	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 97 - Moelfre	Support	Moelfre is served by Benllech Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1259	Mr Neil Fairburn [3290]	Map 97 - Moelfre	Object	The proposal map for Moelfre shows the garden curtilage of my property as having fields. These green areas are my garden,	<b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>not fields and need to be amended.</p> <p>The garden curtilage of Cocyn Uchaf should be included in the LDP for Moelfre as house is part of the village. I am looking to apply for planning permission to build a property within the curtilage for my son and elderly mother (see figure 2 &amp;3).</p>	<p>appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 98) Four Mile Bridge

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1218	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 98 - Four Mile Bridge	Support	Pont Rhyd y Bont is served by Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 99) Trearddur

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1042	Planning Consultant (Ms Jan Tyrer) [1515]	Map 99 - Trearddur	Object	Old Cricket Ground, Trearddur. This site has a fairly recently approved, and now extant planning consent, for the erection of 17 dwellings as a result of the not insubstantial works already undertaken on site. The site contributes to the	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				current 5 year housing land supply and as a committed site for a housing development it should be included in the development boundary for Trearddur Bay as has happened in other LDPs.	<p>In light of this work Trearddur was identified as a Coastal Village under policy TAI 17 in the Deposit Plan with an anticipated growth level of 32 units for the plan period.</p> <p>Land at the Old Cricket ground has had the benefit of planning permission for a number of years but has not been developed to date.</p> <p>The site falls within a C?? flood risk zone. In light of this.....</p> <p>In fact Table 3 in Appendix 5 of the Deposit Plan identifies a number of units from the land bank which are unlikely to be completed and part of the 100 units for Trearddur is the Old Cricket ground site.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1161	Cadnant Planning (Mr Rhys Davies) [1366]	Map 99 - Trearddur	Object	Land adj Timant, Trearddur. It is considered that Trearddur has been categorised incorrectly and should be included as a Service Village under Policy TAI16. It is considered that there is an over-reliance on windfall sites within the LDP. Land should be allocated for housing to accommodate the identified	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>The Deposit Plan recognises a hierarchy of towns and villages which have a specific role and function. Within Topic Paper 5 – Developing the Settlement Strategy a methodology was developed and published to recognise these settlements on the basis of their role, function, range of facilities</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				housing need. It is considered that only allowing local market housing and affordable housing within Trearddur will weaken the community both socially and economically resulting in an increase in deprivation. We wish to propose a site at Lôn St Ffraid to be included in the development boundary and allocated for housing.	<p>and services.</p> <p>The spatial strategy will ensure that development is targeted to locations which are sustainable in terms of size, role, character, facilities, transport links, social inclusion and environment. Therefore, there will be a sustainable pattern of communities which have a viable community.</p> <p>Distributing further growth to villages and clusters beyond what has currently been recognised in Policy PS15 without robust evidence to do so would undermine the spatial strategy and the sustainability principles which the Plan is based upon.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1226	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 99 - Trearddur	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	
1227	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 99 - Trearddur	Support	Trearddur is served by Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 100) Aberdaron

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1317	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 100 - Aberdaron	Support	Aberdaron Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 101) Borth y Gest

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1174	Mr Alun Evans [2854]	Map 101 - Borth y Gest	Object	I feel that the 20 acres of land i own should be included in the boundaries of what is deemed to be land that can be part of this policy i.e. Affordable Housing, the land can be used to build one or two houses, the remainder of the land has much many wildlife benefits and can accordingly be developed into a nature reserve or maintained to preserve the environment. The land in question is as	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				follows SH5637 and SH5638 Borth y Gest, Porthmadog.	not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.  <b>No Change</b>
1318	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 101 - Borth y Gest	Support	Borth y Gest is served by Porthmadog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1012	Mr Dafydd Hughes [3162]	Map 101 – Borth y Gest	Object	Children must have the right to play outside, and most houses in Borth-y-Gest don't have gardens, so this provision must be retained. The playing field is also safe: no danger from cars or from dogs running wild. There has been an increase in the number of children and families, and the park enables families to meet and play safely. Losing the park would remove the heart from such a small village where resources such as those that currently exist enable families to bring up their children in a safe environment. Such a development would place a huge pressure on the village's services, bearing in mind that there is no suitable sewerage system in place or suitable access to the site.	<b>Comment Noted</b> Borth y Gest's playground and surrounding park has identified as a protected open space.  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>

## 102) Clynnog Fawr

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
712	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Map 102 - Clynnog Fawr	Object	As a Coastal/Rural Village, Clynnog is assigned an indicative housing provision of 10 units, all to come from windfall sites. As there are no allocated housing sites, we are puzzled why an extension to the village boundary is shown on the map in north east of the village. It would be preferable to developing land (SP673) in the south west. We understand that part of the latter area is subject to a covenant restricting development and we would oppose housing here, particularly in the southern part of the site, on grounds of adverse visual impact on the church and graveyard.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
714	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Map 102 - Clynnog Fawr	Object	As a Coastal/Rural Village, Clynnog is assigned an indicative housing provision of 10 units, all to come from windfall sites. As there are no allocated housing sites, we are puzzled why an extension to the village boundary is shown on the map in north east of the village. It would be preferable to developing land (SP673) in the south west. We understand that part of the latter area is subject to a covenant restricting development and we would oppose housing here, particularly in the southern part of the site, on grounds of adverse visual impact on the church and graveyard.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1319	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi)	Map 102 - Clynnog Fawr	Support	Clynnog Fawr is served by Pontllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW)	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

### 103) Corris

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1320	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 103 - Corris	Support	Lower Corris Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

### 104) Ederne

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1321	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 104 - Ederne	Support	Ederne is served by Morfa Nefyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

### 105) Fairbourne

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1322	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 105 - Fairbourne	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Fairbourne as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				units and the existing landbank.	<b>No Change</b>

#### 106) Llanaelhaearn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
716	Council for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Map 106 - Llanaelhaearn	Object	A strip to the east of the main road in the south of the village is proposed to be included within the JDLP village development boundary, although there is no allocated housing site or proposal on the candidate site register. Why has this change from the GUDP boundary been made? This may be an appropriate area for infill development given an existing group of buildings to the south and line of housing on the opposite side of the road. However, ribbon development along the main road is a growing source of traffic hazard in this village.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1323	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 106 - Llanaelhaearn	Object	The proposed growth being promoted for this settlement would require improvements at Llanaelhaearn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 107) Llanbedrog

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1025	John Brinley Jones [2087]	Map 107 - Llanbedrog	Object	<p>The site that was included in the Candidate Site Register under site reference number SP422 during the consultation period should be included in the final Plan. The site is 0.17ha in size and is located in a brownfield site in the centre of the village. The development boundary of Llanbedrog lies directly east, south and west of the site with only the North site of the village not included within the Boundary.</p> <p>This site was included within the Draft UDP of Gwynedd in 2004. I only need a single dwelling as a home on the site.</p> <p>To Include Candidate Site SP422 within the development boundary of Llanbedrog, within inset Map 107 Llanbedrog of the Deposit Plan. The site is a brownfield site and is located at the centre of this coastal village. The site was included in the last UDP Deposit Plan back in 2004.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1297	Cyngor Cymuned Llanbedrog (Mr John Harris) [2810]	Map 107 - Llanbedrog	Object	<p>Why has the development boundary for Llanbedrog been extended to include a piece of land on Lon Pwllheli as a red area in the map as an appendix, whilst the land known as SP422 rear of Capel Seion which is coloured blue in the appendix has not been included.</p> <p>Both sites have had planning permission as a parking area etc recently but why haven't both sites been included? Certainly there isn't a consistent</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				approach to extending the boundary where planning permission recently.	soundness of the Plan. <b>No Change</b>
1325	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 107 - Llanbedrog	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Llanbedrog as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank.	<b>Note the Support Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1384	John Brinley Jones [2087]	Map 107 - Llanbedrog	Object	<p>Include SP422 within the development boundary of Llanbedrog. The site is 0.17ha in size and is located in a brownfield site in the centre of the village. The development boundary of Llanbedrog lies directly east, south and west of the site with only the north site of the village not included within the Boundary.</p> <p>The site was included within the draft UDP of Gwynedd in 2004.</p> <p>I only need a single dwelling as a home on the site.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1294	Cyngor Cymuned Llanbedrog (Mr John Harris) [2810]	Map 107 - Llanbedrog	Object	<p>SP715 should be included and identified in the plan as a play area only not development land.</p> <p>The land is Llanbedrog's Playing Field and is owned by Llanbedrog Community Council. The Council wishes to safeguard this playing field.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Established playground in the centre of settlement</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Identify as Protected Open Space on Inset Map.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF130</b></p>
1296	Cyngor Cymuned Llanbedrog (Mr John	Map 107 - Llanbedrog	Object	SP714 should be included and identified in the plan as a play area only. According	<b>Not Accepted</b> No formal play equipment on site. Land

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Harris) [2810]			<p>to the permission granted for Ty'n Pwll Estate 26 May 1376, application number 2/18/3/D - the following condition applies:</p> <p>"Amenity space between plots 7&amp;8 shall be maintained as an open space to the satisfaction of the local planning authority."</p> <p>Please see as an attachement a letter fated Feb 2000 from Gruffydd Wyn Morris - Gwynedd's Planning Manager that states this fact.</p>	<p>has protection via planning condition.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 108) Llangian

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1324	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 108 - Llangian	Support	Llangian is served by Abersoch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 109) Llithfaen

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1326	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 109 - Llithfaen	Support	Llithfaen Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				allocated for this catchment area	<b>No Change</b>

#### 110) Morfa Bychan

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1327	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 110 - Morfa Bychan	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Morfa Bychan as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank.	<b>Note the Support Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

#### 111) Morfa Nefyn

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
465	Tai Twnti Cyf [2868]	Map 111 - Morfa Nefyn	Object	<p>1. Community need housing is not defined. Plan should be clarified to confirm the status of community need housing as open market housing (and not otherwise restricted).</p> <p>2. Additional open market housing sites would not harm the plan strategy nor the welsh language.</p> <p>3. Additional land could be allocated for housing or the development boundary extended to accommodate development. Two sites are suggested.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1328	Dwr Cymru Welsh	Map 111 - Morfa	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Nefyn		Morfa Nefyn as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank	<b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

### 112) Mynytho

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1329	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 112 - Mynytho	Object	There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1330	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 112 - Mynytho	Support	Mynytho Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>

### 113) Rhoshirwaun

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1258	Mr William Rickards	Map 113 -	Object	It is my belief that the alternative site	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	[3289]	Rhoshirwaun		<p>mentioned and outlined in the attached plan is eligible to be included in the deposit plan. My reasons for believing are so:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The site lies between existing dwellings and the construction of a single dwelling would not be harmful to the natural beauty of the area.</li> <li>- The site has existing services as there has been a static caravan on the north side of the site for as long as anyone can remember. If a dwelling was built it would replace the caravan.</li> <li>- The site has adequate access to the highway ie good visibility splay etc</li> <li>- The site is close to Ysgol Llidiardau.</li> </ul>	<p>It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1331	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 113 - Rhoshirwaun	Object	<p>Rhoshirwaen does not have public sewerage facilities therefore the provisions of Circular 10/99 'Planning Requirement in respect of the Use of Non-Mains Sewerage incorporating Septic Tanks in New Development' apply and consultation with Natural Resources Wales will be required.</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### 114) Sarn Bach

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1332	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 114 - Sarn Bach	Support	<p>Sarn Bach is served by Abersoch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows</p>	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>No Change</b>

### 115) Y Felinheli

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
296	Mr Geraint Lewis [2877]	Map 115 - Y Felinheli	Object	The Site adjacent to Y Wern Tan y Maes, Felinheli forms part of the current UDP, this is owned by Mr Lewis who has instructed us to proceed with the development in partnership with CCG who own a plot of land adjacent. CCG are proposing a development of 6 affordable houses and our client is proposing 8 affordable and 8 open market housing. Our main objection is that this plot of land has been omitted from the JLDP for no apparent reason, this is a scheme that will see fruition in the near future.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1024	Amcen Ltd [3186]	Map 115 - Y Felinheli	Object	It is considered that Y Felinheli has been categorised incorrectly and should be included as a Local Service Centre under Policy TAI15. Y Felinheli offers local facilities and services including a primary school, convenience store, post office and a health centre and is located on a bus route linking the village with Caernarfon, Bangor and Llandudno. It is considered that there is an over-reliance on windfall sites within the LDP. Land should be	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> Amending the development boundary is not considered necessary to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>allocated for housing to accommodate the identified housing need.</p> <p>We wish to seek the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Y Felinheli to be categorised as Local Service Centre under Policy TAI15</li> <li>2. Our site at Beach Road should be included within the development boundary of Y Felinheli and allocated for housing.</li> </ol>	<b>No Change</b>
1333	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 115 - Y Felinheli	Support	No additional growth is anticipated in Felinheli as the indicative housing growth is provided for by completed units and the existing landbank.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

#### CLUSTERS

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
1463	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 116 - Bodorgan	Support	Bodorgan is served by Malltraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1464	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 117 - Bro Iarddur (Treaddur)	Support	* Bro Iarddur is served by Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1465	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 118 - Bryn Du	Object	* Bryn Du is served by Rhosneigr Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for	<p><b>Comments Noted</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				this catchment area would require improvements to the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1824	Mr Thomas Conway [3371]	Map 118 - Bryn Du	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Planning approval given for 12 units in the small hamlet of Bryn Du in 2014;</li> <li>* Anglesey's guidance on affordable housing state that they should be sited in settlements where there are public facilities to support them;</li> <li>* Bryn Du does not have any facilities other than limited stopping train service at Ty Croes railway and a limited bus service;</li> <li>* The nearest settlement to Bryn Du is Rhosneigr which is approximately 5 miles away.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies sufficient, deliverable and appropriate housing land in the area and the proposed change is not considered required to ensure the soundness of the plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1466	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 119 - Old Llandegfan	Object	Old Llandegfan is served by Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements to the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1467	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 120 - Brynrefail (Anglesey)	Object	* Brynrefail is served by Rhosneigr Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements to the treatment works which would need to be funded through	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions	matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1468	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 122 - Bwlch Gwyn	Support	* Bwlch Gwyn is served by Benllech Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1016	Mr Dafydd Edwards [3118]	Map 124 – Capel Mawr	Support	Land at Capel Mawr. My client wishes to include the attached plans into the new deposit plan if possible as land available for any possible development - I do not have the policy numbers of inset maps numbers to hand, is it possible to complete this section again.	<b>Not accepted</b> In order to distribute the growth level of the Plan, a growth estimate must be given for the Clusters tier, which is 2 units in each Cluster.  In preparing the distribution strategy within the Plan, the Council considered the dispersed nature of the area against national policies for reducing the need to travel and to locate the largest growth in sustainable locations.  It is felt that distribution in the Deposit Plan has created a suitable balance between national policy and the local situation. Whilst a high growth level of growth in some locations can help somewhat with some local services, having a relaxed development boundary and a higher growth level would possibly lead to other problems within some communities e.g. impact on the Welsh language etc. The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to be able to justify supporting an application to change Capel Mawr’s status in the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					settlement tree.  <b>Recommendation</b> The proposed change is not required to ensure the soundness of the plan.  <b>No Change</b>
1469	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 128 - Cichle	Object	* Cichle is served by Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements to the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1470	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 129 - Haulfre (Llangoed)	Support	* Llangoed Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1471	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 130 - Elim	Support	* Elim is served by Llanddeusant Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1472	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 131 - Glanyrafon	Support	* Glanyrafon is served by Llangoed Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1473	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 132 - Glyngarth	Object	* Glyn Garth is served by Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1474	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 133 - Gaerwen Station	Support	* Gaerwen Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1475	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 135 - Hendre Hywel (Pentraeth)	Object	* Hendre Hywel is served by Pentraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1476	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 136 - Hermon	Support	* Hermon is served by Malltraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1477	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 137 - Llanddeusant	Support	* Llanddeusant Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1478	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 138 - Llanelilian	Support	* Llanelilian is served by Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the growth figure allocated for the	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				catchment area.	<b>No Change</b>
932	Excelsior Properties [3117]	Map 139 - Llanfaes	Object	<p>We wish to object to the exclusion of the Former Lairds Site, Llanfaes from the allocated sites of the Deposit Plan and seek its allocation for mixed use development. The site is a substantial brownfield site located in Llanfaes approximately 1.5km to the north of the coastal town of Beaumaris.</p> <p>It is considered that the site can be allocated for mixed use development incorporating employment, commercial, leisure/ hotel and residential land uses (low, medium and higher density residential) providing a feasible and deliverable re-development proposal for the site. Part of the site could possibly be developed to incorporate an area school and extra care elderly housing. This brownfield site is considered a strategic site. This objection also covers Policy TAI 5 (local market housing) as it makes the Plan unsound and undeliverable.</p> <p>The objector considers that the housing target for Beaumaris can't be achieved and therefore the housing should be re-directed to the Lairds site. The objector also contends that the Plan's overall</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – this is a substantial (15 ha) site on the edge of part of Llanfaes, 1.5km to the east of Beaumaris. Most of the site may be categorised as 'brownfield'. Exclusion of a woodland (covered by a TPO) leaves around 13 ha. Part of the direct vehicular access from Beaumaris to Llanfaes is along a road that is in a C2 flood risk zone, where there are known flooding events.</p> <p>The Plan does support the re-use of brownfield sites. Nonetheless this support is subject to conformity with relevant policies in the Plan, which include the need to align with the Plan's Settlement Hierarchy (Policy PS5 and Policy PS15).</p> <p>Llanfaes is categorised as a 'Cluster' in the Plan's Settlement Hierarchy. The Plan's Strategy (Chapter 6) proposes "some development in Clusters, identified because of their functional links with Villages or Centres, and in the countryside". In housing terms, 25% of the Plan's overall housing is directed to villages, clusters and the countryside. This then equates to 2 affordable housing units to each Cluster (Policy TAI 18). The Plan's distribution strategy was agreed at the Pre-Deposit stage</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				<p>housing figure is insufficient and the absence of a housing allocation in Llangoed and Llanddona should mean that more housing should be directed to Llanfaes.</p>	<p>and then at the Deposit Stage. It has been informed by the Sustainability Appraisal, which in turn has been informed by the Welsh Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Although the objector has submitted a plan that seems to identify different use zones this approach isn't substantiated/ informed by evidence to demonstrate each potential use's deliverability. The proposal is therefore clearly speculative in nature.</p> <p>The objection refers to the site's potential to accommodate an area school. Policy ISA 2 (without prejudice) supports the development of new schools in Clusters, provided that other options have been explored. It is noted that the Council has yet to undertake the process to explore options to provide a new school in this sub area. On this basis, it would clearly be inappropriate for the Plan to allocate part of the site for a new school as it would pre-determine the outcome of another statutory process.</p> <p>In terms of an extra care housing scheme, the Council is currently exploring different options to deliver an alternative provision in this sub area. Again, it would clearly be inappropriate for the Plan to pre-determine</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the results of this work. It is worth noting that relevant policies in the Plan could support an extra care proposal without an allocation, subject to appropriate evidence.</p> <p>As referred to previously other potential uses (apart from housing) could align with relevant policies in the Plan should a proposal be brought forward during the Plan period. These uses (except for housing) could align with relevant policies, without requiring the site to be specifically allocated for such uses.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to locate market housing and affordable housing on the site.</p> <p>It should be noted that Llanfaes lies within a ward where the local market housing policy would apply (Policy TAI 15), which the objector is seeking to deviate from in relation to this site. Notwithstanding concerns about the level of housing in relation to the Plan's Strategy, support for a mixed use development that includes housing in accordance with the objection would clearly undermine the Plan's approach to facilitate homes for local communities.</p> <p>No housing figure is provided by the</p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>objector in his submission. In trying to clarify this position the objector has indicated that the proposed housing zone could equate to between 55 – 90 housing units. This clearly would be in excess of the number of units being facilitated by the Strategy and the Policy that deals with Clusters. The indicative figure referred to by the objector is based on diversion of housing units currently identified for Beaumaris to the proposed site on the basis that the settlement will not be able to accommodate this level of growth. The objector hasn't been able to demonstrate that there is no capacity within Beaumaris for the indicative level of growth. Additionally, the objector challenges the Plan's overall housing figure.</p> <p>Bearing the above in mind, the site's size, and the fact that there is no clear/ substantiated commitment to deliver other uses on the site, the site's inclusion within the Plan as an allocation could equate to a substantial number of houses which would be over and above what accords with the Policy and the Strategy set out in the Plan. On the basis that Policy TAI 5 promotes local market housing in the ward that includes Beaumaris and Llanfaes, and the concern about the number of potential housing units</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the proposal would clearly undermine the Plan's Growth and Spatial and therefore the Housing Strategy. This is considered be a fundamental change to the Plan to the extent that it would not meet the soundness tests.</p> <p>The Committee's attention is also drawn to a previous development plan Inspector's report, which did not support residential development on the site. The Inspector's report can be viewed on the website at <a href="http://www.anglesey.gov.uk/planning-and-waste/planning-policy/current-plans-and-policies/unitary-development-plan/inspectors-report-2004?redirect=false">http://www.anglesey.gov.uk/planning-and-waste/planning-policy/current-plans-and-policies/unitary-development-plan/inspectors-report-2004?redirect=false</a> , which also deals with the site's location with the AONB.</p> <p>Given the reference to the site's possible suitability as a site for a new school and/ or extra care housing the objection has been discussed with key officers within IACC. It is understood that the Council is exploring avenues to address the fact that Llanfaes includes a number of disadvantaged households. Within this context the site is seen as somewhere that could deliver new opportunities for the community on its doorstep. Additionally, Llanfaes is</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>considered to be a suburb of Beaumaris, having close social connections and should be categorised as one settlement in the hierarchy. Officers within the Council therefore consider that this approach provides a basis for the matter to be dealt with as a focussed change.</p> <p>Nonetheless, as set out above, it is considered that the Plan could facilitate various types of development on the site without its allocation as a mixed use site. There is no evidence before the Unit to demonstrate the connection between the settlements that justifies recategorising Llanfaes, without undermining the Strategy set out in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There is no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan to allocate this site for a mixed use that includes housing. Such a change is considered to be a fundamental change that goes to the heart of the Plan, undermining the soundness of the Plan. The Plan could, with the provision of relevant evidence, facilitate the other uses put forward (except for housing) without allocating the site.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No change</b>
383	Mr Emyr Jones [2935]	Map 139 - Llanfaes	Object	<p>This policy defines the village of Llanfaes as a cluster. A more appropriate categorisation would be as a local village, given its size and characteristics. There are discrepancies in the assessment process which has been carried out, given that Talwrn for example, a settlement similar in characteristics to Llanfaes, has been defined as a local village. There is a need for both affordable and market housing in Llanfaes to support and develop local services. The site identified as SP49 in the Candidate Site Register would be a suitable site for small scale expansion of the village.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>In order to distinguish between a Village and a Cluster, 9 specific facilities were identified as being essential, and are those defined by the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. To ensure consistency and higher levels of growth in a more sustainable centre, at least one of these key facilities was essential.</p> <p>Llanfaes has none of these specific facilities and therefore it has been categorised as a Cluster in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no robust evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1479	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 139 - Llanfaes	Object	<p>* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system in Llanfaes that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat,</p>	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<b>No Change</b>
1480	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 139 - Llanfaes	Object	* Llanfaes is served by Beaumaris Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1481	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 141 - Llangadwaladr	Support	* Llangadwaladr is served by Malltraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the growth figure allocated for the catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1482	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 142 - Llansadwrn	Object	* Llansadwrn is served by Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1483	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 144 - Llynfaes	Support	* Llynfaes Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1484	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi	Map 146 - Mynydd Mechell	Support	* Mynydd Mechell is served by Llanfechell Wastewater Treatment Works	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			(WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1485	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 147 - Nebo (Anglesey)	Support	* Nebo is served by Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1486	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 148 - Penygroes (Anglesey)	Support	* Penygroes is served by Llanddeusant Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1487	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 149 - Pen y Marian	Support	* Pen y Marian is served by Llangoed Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1488	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 150 - Pengorffwysfa	Support	* Pengorffwysfa is served by Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1489	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 151 - Penlon	Support	* Penlon is served by Newborough Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1490	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 153 - Pentre Berw	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system in Pentre Berw that may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1491	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 153 - Pentre Berw	Support	* Pentre Berw is served by Gaerwen Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1492	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 156 - Bull Bay	Support	* Bull Bay is served by Amlwch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1493	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 157 - Rhoscefnhir	Object	* Rhoscefnhir is served by Pentraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1494	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 158 - Rhosmeirch	Support	* Rhosmeirch is served by Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
463	Mr & Mrs O R & M	Map 159 -	Object	Rhostrehwfa has been classified as a	<b>Not Accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Roberts [2955]	Rhostrehwfa		cluster settlement despite having many of the characteristics of a local village. It is important to the health and vitality of the village that new housing is brought forward on suitable site(s). The limitation imposed by cluster designation combined with the tightly drawn boundary of such designation will act to impede any reasonable prospect of new housing development. Other local villages such as Llangristiolus, which displays many similar characteristics, have a local village designation. Suitable sites such as site ref SP163 on the Candidate Site register should be included within a redrawn boundary.	<p>Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>In order to distinguish between a Village and a Cluster, 9 specific facilities were identified as being essential, and are those defined by the Welsh Index of Multiple Deprivation. To ensure consistency and higher levels of growth in a more sustainable centre, at least one of these key facilities was essential.</p> <p>Rhostrehwfa has none of these specific facilities and therefore it has been categorised as a Cluster in the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no robust evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1495	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 159 - Rhostrehwfa	Support	* Rhostrehwfa is served by Llangefni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1496	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 160 - Bryn y Mor (Valley)	Support	* Bryn y Mor is served by Holyhead Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				allocated for this catchment area.	<b>No Change</b>
1497	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 161 - Rhydwyn	Support	* Rhydwyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1403	Mr Brian Owen [3108]	Map 162 - Star	Object	<p>Request that the land edged red to be included in the new plan for adoption. The proposed site is an infill between existing buildings of 'Dol Fraint' and 'Dolwen' as stated in TAI 18. If agreed prepared to 2No units stated in your policy.</p> <p>To include land edged red in the new 'Plan' for adoption to TAI 18 - Housing in Clusters.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>In order to distribute the growth level of the Plan, a growth estimate must be given for the Clusters tier, which is 2 units in each Cluster.</p> <p>In preparing the distribution strategy within the Plan, the Council considered the dispersed nature of the area against national policies for reducing the need to travel and to locate the largest growth in sustainable locations.</p> <p>It is felt that distribution in the Deposit Plan has created a suitable balance between national policy and the local situation. Whilst a high growth level of growth in some locations can help somewhat with some local services, having a relaxed development boundary and a higher growth level would possibly lead to other problems within some communities e.g. impact on the Welsh language etc. The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to be able to justify supporting an application to change Star's status in the settlement tree.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p>No specific sites are identified within Clusters rather it is a criteria based policy that deems whether a site can be considered as suitable if the land is adjacent to a property coloured in red on the inset map.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1498	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 162 - Star	Support	* Star is served by Llanfairpwll Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>
450	Mr B Pritchard [2951]	Map 166 - Tynyngogl	Object	<p>It is not clear why the development boundary for Benllech has been drawn to exclude the housing area around Tynyngogl to the west. This forms part of the urban area of Benllech and functions as part of the town. There is no logical reason to define this area as a cluster village given its relationship with the rest of Benllech. Future housing development within Benllech can be accommodated on sites other than that shown on the proposals map, namely site SP161 on the Candidate Site register. This is suitable land for the expansion of the town.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Tynyngogl has historically been identified as a separate settlement rather than a part of Benllech since there is a break in the built form from Benllech to Tynyngogl.</p> <p>Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.</p> <p>Based on this methodology Tynyngogl has been identified as a Cluster within the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<b>No Change</b>
1499	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 166 - Tynyngonl	Support	* Tynyngonl is served by Benllech Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1500	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 167 - Aberdesach	Support	* Aberdesach is served by Pontllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1501	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 168 - Aberllefenni	Support	* Aberllefenni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1502	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 170 - Bethesda Bach	Object	* Bethesda Bach is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1503	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 171 - Bryncir	Support	* Bryncir Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1504	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 172 - Bryncroes	Support	* Bryncroes Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1505	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 173 - Bryn Eglwys	Support	* Bryn Eglwys is served by Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1506	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 174 - Bwlchto cyn	Object	* There are isolated incidents of flooding in the public sewerage system that, depending on the location of the development, may need to be resolved to allow development to proceed. Potential developers can either wait for DCWW to resolve the flooding, subject to funding being approved by our regulator Ofwat, or progress the improvements through the sewerage requisition provisions of the Water Industry Act 1991 or S106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1507	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 174 - Bwlchto cyn	Support	* Bwlchto cyn is served by Abersoch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1508	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 176 - Caerhun / Waen Wen	Support	* Caerhun is served by Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1509	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 177 - Capel Uchaf	Support	* Capel Uchaf is served by Pontllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				allocated for this catchment area.	<b>No Change</b>
1510	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 178 - Capel y Graig (Bangor)	Object	* Capel y Graig is served by Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1511	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 180 - Corris Uchaf	Support	* Corris Uchaf Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1512	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 181 - Crawia	Support	* Crawiau is served by Llanrug Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1513	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 183 - Dinorwig	Support	* Bro Elidir Dinorwig Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1514	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 185 - Gallt y Foel	Support	* Gallt y Foel is served by Deiniolen Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1515	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 186 - Glasinfryn	Support	* Glasinfryn is served by Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				allocated for this catchment area.	<b>No Change</b>
1516	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 187 - Groeslon (Waunfawr)	Support	* Waunfawr Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1229	Mr Alun Morris [2956]	Map 189 - Llandderfel	Object	We would appreciate if the land that has been appended and outlined in red could be included in the local development plan as it is a very suitable site to be developed as an affordable home for a young couple who wish to remain in their local communities. Only a very small number of sites are being developed in the rural village of Llandderfel, therefore, including this land to build one affordable home would not have a detrimental impact on the sensitive character (environmental and social) of the Village.	<b>Not Accepted</b> In order to distribute the growth level of the Plan, a growth estimate must be given for the Clusters tier, which is 2 units in each Cluster.  In preparing the distribution strategy within the Plan, the Council considered the dispersed nature of the area against national policies for reducing the need to travel and to locate the largest growth in sustainable locations.  It is felt that distribution in the Deposit Plan has created a suitable balance between national policy and the local situation. Whilst a high growth level of growth in some locations can help somewhat with some local services, having a relaxed development boundary and a higher growth level would possibly lead to other problems within some communities e.g. impact on the Welsh language etc. The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to be able to justify supporting an application to change Star's status in the settlement tree.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					No specific sites are identified within Clusters rather it is a criteria based policy that deems whether a site can be considered as suitable if the land is adjacent to a property coloured in red on the inset map. the Plan being satisfied. <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1517	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 189 - Llandderfel	Support	* Llandderfel Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1518	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 190 - Llanengan	Support	* Llanengan is served by Abersoch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1519	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 191 - Llanfor	Support	* Llanfor Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1520	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 193 - Llaniestyn	Support	* Llaniestyn Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1521	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 194 - Llanllechid	Object	* Llanllechid is served by Bethesda Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1522	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 195 - Llannor	Support	* Llannor Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1523	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 196 - Llanwnda	Object	* Llanwnda is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1271	RI & C Jones [2147]	Map 197 - Llwyn Hudol	Object	We would like Bryn Tirion to be included within the Llwyn Hudol cluster. It is already within the access road to 8 of the existing dwellings. The site has been identified as SP760.	<b>Not accepted</b> Topic Paper 5 'Developing the Settlement Strategy' outlines the methodology used to identify the role of different centres within the Plan area.  To be identified as a Cluster, there must be a cohesive group of 10 or more houses, with an operational link to a higher level centre based on its location on a bus route with a bus stop, or within 800 meters of a bus stop.  Bryn Tirion is not considered to form part of a cohesive group and therefore is not appropriate to be identified as a coloured building within the Cluster.



Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b> There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1524	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 197 - Llwyn Hudol	Support	* Llwyn Hudol is served by Pwllheli Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1525	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 198 - Machroes	Support	* Machroes is served by Abersoch Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1526	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 199 - Maes Tryfan	Object	* Maes Tryfan is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1527	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 200 - Minffordd	Support	* Minffordd is served by Penrhyndeudraeth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<p><b>Note the Support</b></p>
1528	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 201 - Minffordd (Bangor)	Object	* Minffordd (Bangor) is served by Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works	<p><b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			(WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions	DCWW at the planning application stage.  <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.  <b>No Change</b>
1529	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 202 - Mynydd Llandygai	Support	* Mynydd Llandygai is served by Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1530	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 203 - Nebo	Support	* Nebo is served by Llanllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1531	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 204 - Pant Glas	Support	* Pantglas Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1532	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 205 - Pencaenewydd	Support	* Pencaenewydd Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1533	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 206 - Penmorfa	Support	* Penmorfa is served by Porthmadog Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>
1534	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 207 - Penrhos	Support	* Penrhos Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul	<b>Note the Support</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
	Griffiths ) [2680]			flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1535	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 208 - Pentir	Support	* Pentir is served by Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1536	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 209 - Pentrefelin	Support	* Pentrefelin Dwyfor Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1537	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 210 - Pistyll	Support	* Pistyll Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1274	Ms Helena Jones [2864]	Map 211 - Pontllyfni	Object	<p>I wish for the SP157 section of land to be considered part of the Pontllyfni cluster. There is a need to extend the Deposit Plan in order for Burnside and Dolwen to be earmarked red within the area.</p> <p>The section of land in question is not agricultural land. In the past, it was part of the garden of an adjacent house, namely Burnside. The land has a wide, clear and convenient access. The land is surrounded by trees and it is not intended to fell these trees. The location of the land and the trees around it would not disturb other views in the area, should it be developed. There is currently</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>In order to distribute the growth level of the Plan, a growth estimate must be given for the Clusters tier, which is 2 units in each Cluster.</p> <p>In preparing the distribution strategy within the Plan, the Council considered the dispersed nature of the area against national policies for reducing the need to travel and to locate the largest growth in sustainable locations.</p> <p>It is felt that distribution in the Deposit Plan has created a suitable balance between national policy and the local situation. Whilst</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				a garage and a caravan on the land with facilities such as electricity, water, sewerage and a phone line.	<p>a high growth level of growth in some locations can help somewhat with some local services, having a relaxed development boundary and a higher growth level would possibly lead to other problems within some communities e.g. impact on the Welsh language etc. The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to be able to justify supporting an application to change Star's status in the settlement tree.</p> <p>No specific sites are identified within Clusters rather it is a criteria based policy that deems whether a site can be considered as suitable if the land is adjacent to a property coloured in red on the inset map.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1538	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 211 - Pontllyfni	Support	* Pontllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>
1539	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 212 - Rhiw	Support	* Rhiw Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>
1540	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 213 - Rhos Isaf	Object	* Rhos Isaf is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works	<p><b>Comments Noted</b></p> <p>The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1541	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 214 - Rhoslan	Support	* Rhoslan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>
1542	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 215 - Rhydyclafdy	Support	* Rhydyclafdy Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>
1543	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 216 - Sarn (Llanwnda)	Object	* Sarn is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1544	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 217 - Sling	Support	* Sling is served by Tregarth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b>
1545	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 218 - Swan	Support	* Swan is served by Pontllyfni Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1546	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 219 - Tai'n Lon	Support	* Tai Lon Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				allocated for this catchment area.	<b>No Change</b>
1547	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 220 - Talwaenydd	Support	* Talwaenydd Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1548	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 221 - Talybont	Support	* Talybont Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1549	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 222 - Tan y Coed	Support	* Tan y Coed is served by Llanrug Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW) which can accommodate the foul flows from the proposed growth figure allocated for this catchment area.	<b>Note the Support</b> <b>Recommendation</b> <b>No Change</b>
1550	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 224 - Ty'n Lon	Object	* Ty'n-Lon is served by Llanfaglan Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer contributions.	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised. <b>No Change</b>
1551	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths ) [2680]	Map 225 - Ty'n y Lon, Treborth (Bangor)	Object	* Ty'n y Lon is served by Treborth Wastewater Treatment Works (WwTW). The proposed growth being promoted for this catchment area would require improvements at the treatment works which would need to be funded through our Asset Management Plan or potentially earlier through developer	<b>Comments Noted</b> The Councils will continue to engage with DCWW at the planning application stage. <b>Recommendation</b> No change is required to address the matters raised.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and Recommendations
				contributions	<b>No Change</b>
1398	MR Taliesyn Roberts [2711]	Map 226 - Waun (Penisarwaun)	Object	<p>Waun (Penisarwaun) consists of a tight cluster of 21 houses around Tai Arthur as well as the more scattered development of 10 houses shown on map 226. In accordance with paragraph 7.4.129 "Inset Plans are provided to identify the cohesive nature of each cluster with relevant buildings coloured to allow the assessment against the second criteria within the policy", the cluster centred around Tai Arthur, Waun should be shown as inset Map 226.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> Following a review of the group of houses suggested by the objector the Unit are satisfied that these are appropriate to be included as an additional group to form part of Waun (Penisarwaun).</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> That the Plan be amended through the identification of this group as a second cohesive group that forms part of Waun (Penisarwaun) in policy TAI 18 Clusters. This is to ensure consistency within the Plan.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF131</b></p>