

Joint Local Development Plan Anglesey & Gwynedd (2011-2026)

Examination

Hearing Session 6
NATURAL AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT
9.30 am, Wednesday 14 September 2016

Further written statement and evidence to be considered by the Planning Inspectors in support of objections to the **Deposit Plan 2015**, made by Paul Madden (responder 609) and Anglesey Branch, CPRW (responder 591, 078, 711) in respect of *Section 7.5 – Natural and Built Environment*.

For original objections see attachments Appendix 1 (Paul Madden Deposit Plan consultation response), Appendix 2 (CPRW Deposit Plan consultation response), Appendix 3 (CPRW letter of 28th January 2016), Appendix 4 (JLDP Unit reply) and Appendix 5 (CPRW Focussed Changes consultation response).

Statement Key

Bold text = Deposit Plan policies and other matters that require attention.

Red text = extracts from the Deposit Plan.

Purple text = the precise change/wording that is being sought.

Blue text = extracts from Deposit Plan Supporting Documents.

Green text = extracts from Documents used and supplied as evidence.

Natural Environment Agenda item 1.

Policy PS16 and Table 23 – is unsound - it is not appropriate and will not deliver due to procedural, consistency, coherence & effectiveness defects.

1) It is clear that Strategic Policy PS16 (see red text below) and its associated Table 23, is incomplete and so does not provide an appropriate framework for the consideration of development proposals and the conservation and enhancement of the natural environment.

Strategic Policy PS16 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

The Councils will manage development so as to conserve and enhance the Plan area's distinctive natural environment, countryside and coastline, and proposals that have an adverse effect on them will be refused. When considering permitting an application the Planning Authorities will ensure that they are:

1. Safeguarding the Plan area's habitats and species, geology, history and landscapes;
2. Protecting and enhancing sites of international, national, regional and local importance and, their settings in line with National Policy;
3. Having regard to the relative significance of the designations in considering the weight to be attached to acknowledged interests in line with National Policy;
4. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity within the Plan area and enhancing and/or restoring networks of natural habitats in accordance with the Local Biodiversity Action Plan and Policy AMG4;
5. Protecting and enhancing biodiversity through networks of green/ blue infrastructure;
6. Safeguarding internationally, nationally and locally protected species;
7. Protecting, retaining or enhancing the local character and distinctiveness of the individual Landscape Character Areas (in line with Policy AMG2) and Seascape Character Areas (in line with Policy AMG3);
8. Protecting, retaining or enhancing trees, hedgerows or woodland of visual, ecological, historic cultural or amenity value.

2) The international status of Anglesey's geological landscape places a duty of care on the Welsh Government and Local Planning Authority. However the significance of Anglesey's natural environment has not been given sufficient weight or recognition in the Deposit Plan. GeoMon Global Geopark must be clearly signposted in the Strategic Policy for the Natural Environment; and must be specifically catered for in the Detailed Policies in Section 7.5. Reference to this international designation and status should be reiterated throughout the Plan for Anglesey, so as to gain the full social, economic and environmental benefit from this high value, special and indeed unique natural environment.

3) **PS16 points 2 and 3** refer to "National Policy" but not to international obligations. This omission should be rectified. So for example point 2 should be extended to read as follows "**2. Protecting and enhancing sites of international, national, regional and local importance, and their settings in line with National Policy and with due regard to international obligations.**" Point 3 should also refer to our international obligations.

4) The JLDP also needs to underline the special significance of Anglesey's AONB, by fully incorporating the statutory duty the Local Planning Authority has for the AONB within **Strategic Policy PS16**, by adding the following wording to **PS16. 2. " and with regard to AONB Management Plans"**.

5) And by allocating a specific Detailed Policy in Section 7.5 to describe the fragile nature of Anglesey's AONB, which forms a narrow circumference around Ynys Mon. Given the shape of the designated area it is difficult to ensure it is protected and enhanced. But it is essential that it is and that the relationship between the AONB and the Global Geopark is highlighted. Without these alterations PS16 in the Deposit Plan is an inadequate framework for the consideration of development proposals in Anglesey's highly valued natural environment.

Suggested new Detailed Policy:-

AMG0: ANGLESEY'S AONB – Within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (which includes defined Heritage Coast, Beaumaris World Heritage Site and GeoMon Global Geopark) shown on the Proposals Map, the Council will give priority to the protection and enhancement of the landscape when considering planning applications.

Reference should also be made to the AONB Management Plan, and the following wording is suggested:- **The AONB Management Plan will be taken into consideration where developments are considered appropriate subject to associated planning conditions and/or mitigation measures.**

6) PS16 point 7 should include reference to **Special Landscape Areas**, otherwise it is incomplete.

7) PS16 point 3 should recognise that adjoining coastal and marine designations interact physically and aesthetically with Anglesey's AONB. This accumulation of designations within and adjacent to Anglesey's AONB make the requirement for robust protection and enhancement more compelling than if we consider the AONB features in isolation.

8) The international significance of Anglesey's geology and landscape is now recognised by the UNESCO Global Geopark designation (equivalent in status to a World Heritage Site). Prior to this Anglesey's outstanding geology and landscape was effectively recognised in the Ynys Mon Local Plan 1996, Policy 31, as the SLA applied to all Anglesey's interior countryside. Policy 31 should not have been removed from the JLDP without proper public consultation and a better science based rationale. It should be re-instated in the JLDP for Anglesey with the addition of a specific duty of care for the UNESCO site. The procedural objections referred to below would then be nullified.

If it is considered that the non-statutory designation of the SLA is insufficient to deal with the UNESCO site, then a specific new policy, designed to protect the Global Geopark needs to be included in Section 7.5 of the JLDP.

The UNESCO designation is made in recognition of outstanding geological sites and landscapes around the world. There are just 120 Global Geoparks, 7 are in the UK:-

<http://www.unesco.org.uk/designation/geoparks/>

Therefore the following wording and description of GeoMon Global Geopark should be included in **paragraph 7.5.1 Context:-**

UNESCO has designated Anglesey as a Global Geopark. The site is named GeoMon. This international status has been awarded to 120 sites worldwide. In the case of Anglesey the designation is made to protect the Island as a unified geographical area of international geological significance. The tectonic island of Anglesey includes more than a hundred different rock types and the oldest fossils in England or Wales within 1,800 million years of Earth's history. GeoMon is the UK's most geologically diverse Global Geopark.

9) Paragraph 7.5.2 of the Deposit Plan, which states "Part of Anglesey is designated as a Geopark." is factually incorrect and must be amended. This is currently the only reference in the Deposit Plan to the international designation and as such it is clearly inadequate.

For more information on GeoMon see:-

<http://www.geomon.co.uk/>

10) Appropriate weight must be given in the JLDP to the special nature of 'GeoMon Global GeoPark', and to the fact that Anglesey's island nature has created a cultural heritage that derives from both the geology and geography of the place.

There are significant economic opportunities attached to the Global Geopark status providing we recognise and market Anglesey as a unique place, using the Geopark label to the full, working with local partners and businesses, to raise awareness and leverage the potential of the GeoMon Global Geopark

brand to further encourage international acclaim, business, educational and cultural activities, and eco-tourism:-

*“The UK's Global Geoparks generated an estimated **£8.7 million** from April 2014 to March 2015 through their association with the global network”.*

Source: Wider Value of UNESCO to the UK 2014 – 2015”:-

<http://www.unesco.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/UK-National-Commission-for-UNESCO-Wider-Value-of-UNESCO-to-the-UK-UK-Organisations-January-2016.pdf#32>

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) is the UN agency with global responsibility for protecting cultural heritage internationally. The following link provides more information about the Global Geopark designation:-

http://www.globalgeopark.org/UploadFiles/2012_9_6/IGGP_EN_Statutes_and_Guidelines.pdf

11) So it is clear that specific reference must be made to GeoMon Global Geopark in PS16 and the associated policies for Anglesey. The following extracts from UNESCO’s Statutes and Guidelines provide useful background and should be included on page 169, **Introduction for PS16 and Table 23:-**

The UK Government and the UK National Commission for UNESCO have supported the process for Global Geoparks to become part of a formal UNESCO programme.

During the 38th session of UNESCO’s General Conference in 2015, the 195 Member States of UNESCO ratified the creation of a new label, the UNESCO Global Geoparks. This expresses governmental recognition of the importance of managing outstanding geological sites and landscapes in a holistic manner, and also provides a new international status to a former network of sites of geological significance,

UNESCO Global Geoparks are single, unified geographical areas where sites and landscapes of international geological significance are managed with a holistic concept of protection, education and sustainable development. The international geological significance of a UNESCO Global Geopark is

determined by scientific professionals, as part of a “UNESCO Global Geopark Evaluation Team”, who make a globally comparative assessment based on the peer-reviewed, published research conducted on geological sites within the area. UNESCO Global Geoparks use geological heritage, in connection with all other aspects of that area’s natural and cultural heritage, to enhance awareness and understanding of key issues facing society in the context of the dynamic planet we all live on.

12) The UK is also signed up to the following UNESCO programme:-

Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972) – Ratified by the United Kingdom in May 1984. The 1972 World Heritage Convention links together in a single document the concepts of nature conservation and the preservation of cultural properties. The Convention recognises the way in which people interact with nature, and the fundamental need to preserve the balance between the two. The Convention defines the kind of natural or cultural sites which can be considered for inscription on the World Heritage List. The Convention sets out the duties of States Parties in identifying potential sites and their role in protecting and preserving them. By signing the Convention, each country pledges to conserve not only the World Heritage sites situated on its territory, but also to protect its national heritage. The States Parties are encouraged to integrate the protection of the cultural and natural heritage into regional planning programmes, set up staff and services at their sites, undertake scientific and technical conservation research and adopt measures which give this heritage a function in the day-to-day life of the community.

Source: http://www.unesco.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/UK-National-Commission-for-UNESCO_Wider-Value-of-UNESCO-to-the-UK_UK-Organisations_January-2016.pdf#32

This convention is also relevant to the Local Development Plan for Anglesey. Ynys Mon is a Global Geopark with a World Heritage Site (Beaumaris Castle), local vernacular architectural, agrarian and seafaring heritage that is physically and culturally rooted in the local geology, natural landscape and seascape.

The **Convention concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972)**, **Beaumaris World Heritage Site**, and **GeoMon UNESCO Global Geopark** should be **included in Table 23**, referenced to the relevant UK legislation or adoption mechanism.

13) Turning now to procedural matters, it is clear that there was no proper public consultation at the initial stage of the plan making process i.e. the Issues and Options stage. The JLDP is a replacement for the current statutory Local Plan i.e. Ynys Mon Local Plan 1996.

Policy 31 is a highly significant part of Anglesey's current statutory plan. The subsequent stopped Unitary Development Plan (2005) is only a non-statutory 'material consideration'. Furthermore the general public will not necessarily be well versed, or even familiar with the contents of a non-statutory document. Those people who are not planning professionals will use the current statutory Local Plan as the basis for comparison and consultation around a proposed new statutory plan. If the LPA intended to make a major change to the definition of an SLA on Anglesey in the JLDP, this should have been drawn to the attention of all stakeholders at the earliest opportunity and been highlighted in the initial main consultation document, not merely in supporting documents. The public should not have to plough through supplementary documents that were sometimes unavailable or only available from inaccessible websites, to discover that the Special Landscape Area status that the whole of Anglesey has had since 1996 is no longer considered appropriate for the JLDP.

Consultations are a vehicle for obtaining information from stakeholders on which sound judgements can be made. Where Local Plans are concerned they are an opportunity to allow communities to buy-in to the decisions that are being made for the place where they live and work.

14) In placing its reliance primarily on Landmap (in respect of landscape), the Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment has failed to identify all those matters which should be included and assessed. This led to the failings within Strategic Policy PS16.

The **Sustainability Appraisal Deposit Plan 2015** report, paragraphs 1.8, 1.9 and 1.12 informs the public that:-

In Wales, sustainable development means enhancing the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of people and communities, achieving a better quality of life for our own and future generations:

**In ways which promote social justice and equality of opportunity; and
In ways which enhance the natural and cultural environment and respect its limits – using only our fair share of the earth’s resources and sustaining our cultural legacy.**

Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) ...is a process to ensure that the significant environmental effects arising from plans and programmes are identified, assessed, mitigated, communicated to decision makers and monitored. The SEA process requires the consideration of both positive and negative effects of the implementation of plans and their policies and can be used to inform and enable positive and pro-active environmental measures.

The SEA Regulations require that defined environmental issues are covered in the assessment process, namely:

Biodiversity

Population

Human health

Fauna

Flora

Soil

Water

Air

Climatic factors

Material assets

Cultural heritage

Landscape

The inter-relationship between the above.

15) However The Sustainability Appraisal Framework fails to give sufficient emphasis to landscape because it restricts the assessment and indicators to the use of LANDMAP and the AONB designation as can be seen from **Table 2.2. SA Framework Objective No 8, which is set out as follows:-**

8. Value, conserve and enhance the plan area's rural landscapes and urban townscapes

(SEA Topics: landscape)

Will the plan:

Protect and enhance the special landscape qualities of the plan area, including AONBs, coastal/ seascapes and townscapes.

Protect and improve the quality of publicly accessible open space in rural and built environments

Ensure that new developments are appropriately and sensitively integrated with the landscape and townscape character of the plan area.

Proposed Indicators:

Proportion of high/very high quality landscape identified by LANDMAP

Number / proportion of new developments within AONB's

Number / proportion of new developments within areas classed as outstanding by LANDMAP.

This is clearly revealed to be inadequate when we look at **Table 2.6 SA Framework for Site Options.**

At point 1 "**Maintain and enhance biodiversity interests and connectivity**", the need to "Conserve and enhance designated geological sites and wider geodiversity" is included, but it is in the biodiversity context and no practical assessment is made.

At point 8 "**Value conserve and enhance the plan area's rural landscapes**" The context is again limited with only the AONB; the Landmap evaluation, and the 'Candidate Site' process being recognised.

The omission of what was at that time, a European Geopark, is of great concern and demonstrates that the assessment process was flawed.

16) In 2014 there was a '**Review of Relevant Plans, Programmes and Strategies**'. The Strategic Assessment report tells us:-

"The LPA must take into account the relationship between the LDP and other relevant plans, programmes and policies. The SEA Directive specifically requires environmental protection objectives established at International, European Community or national levels to be taken into account."

And

“Appendix 1 of the Scoping Report presented a review of the plans and programmes considered to be of relevance to the JLDP. The key objectives and implications of relevant plans and programmes were summarised under each topic, whilst the key messages of the review were summarised in the main text of the Scoping report.”

17) However the review failed to re-consider or make a fresh assessment of Anglesey’s longstanding island-wide SLA, despite the huge reduction in the land area of Anglesey designated SLA in the Deposit Plan compared with the designation in the current statutory plan. No-one appears to have asked the obvious question – what is it about Anglesey’s landscape that has changed so drastically since 1996? There was no consideration of the UNESCO designation for GeoMon, simply an additional statement in

APPENDIX 2 – Proposed Modifications to the SA Scoping Report as follows:-

Landscape

9.2 Located on Anglesey is GeoMon. This Geopark is based around the extraordinary diversity of its geology which encompasses solid rocks from the Precambrian to the Neogene with some Miocene sediments and extensive Pleistocene glaciation features from the Quaternary period.

18) So the opportunity to assess how the special landscape, geology and historic environment could be better integrated into the vision and objectives of the Plan was missed, despite the Strategic Objective SO25 on page 92 of the Sustainability Appraisal being:-

“SO25: Identify, protect and where possible enhance places, landscapes and buildings of historical, cultural and archaeological importance and their settings.”

The failure to identify and thus protect the UNESCO Geopark site in the Strategic Environmental Assessment is all the more extraordinary when the **vision for the JLDP** is:-

“By 2026, Anglesey and Gwynedd will be recognised for their vibrant and lively communities that celebrate their unique culture, heritage and environment and for being places where people choose to live, work and visit. This means that the JLDP area will be one:.....

...where the unique character of its built and cultural heritage, its countryside and landscape, and its environment is valued, protected and enhanced”.

19) Despite this strong statement within the Vision for the Deposit Plan, and despite the statutory duty of care for internationally designated sites, Anglesey’s island- wide SLA and its two UNESCO sites (the Global Geopark and World Heritage Site) do not appear in **PS16 Table 23** or the **Deposit Plan Appendix 7 – List of Protected Areas**.

These omissions must be rectified with the following:- [Anglesey SLA](#); [UNESCO Global Geopark GeoMon](#); [UNESCO World Heritage Site Beaumaris Castle](#).

[GeoMon UNESCO Global Geopark](#) should also be included in **SO16 Draft Amended Monitoring Framework**.

20) Only when the Strategic Policy PS16 is complete as a strategic framework is it possible to review the more detailed policies within section 7.5.

Natural Environment Agenda item 2.

Policy AMG1 – is unsound- it is not appropriate in respect of Anglesey as it is not supported by robust evidence and does not comply with National Policy due to procedural, consistency, coherence & effectiveness defects

21) When we come to consider the detailed policies in the Deposit Plan it is useful in the first instance to look at the 3 landscape policies and associated text in the current statutory local plan (Ynys Môn Local Plan 1996) See blue type below:-

Landscape.

Policy 30. Within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (which includes defined Heritage Coast) shown on the Proposals Map, the Council will give priority to the protection and enhancement of the landscape when considering planning applications.

4.26 The Council considers that all parts of Ynys Môn have special landscape qualities. The conservation of natural beauty should be the overriding objective in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and along the Heritage Coast.

Policy 31. With the exception of the AONB, and that land which falls within the settlement boundaries as defined in the Plan, the island is designated as a Special Landscape Area. Proposals for development in the Special Landscape Area will be expected to have particular regard to the special character of their surroundings. In considering the landscape impact of any proposal, the Council will need to be satisfied that the development can be fitted into its surroundings, without unacceptable harm to the general landscape character, before planning permission is granted.

4.27 In recognising that Ynys Môn is a series of working communities, the Plan accepts that development will be needed to support these communities. This development should reflect the landscape character of the surrounding area. Policy 31 will ensure that the development maintains the qualities of these recognised local landscape types.

Policy 32. The Council will refuse applications which result in the loss of trees, hedgerows, stone walls, 'cloddiau' and other traditional landscape features unless acceptable proposals are included for their replacement. Appropriate management of these features will be encouraged generally and particularly by the imposition of conditions on planning permissions where appropriate, the use of planning obligations and by entering management agreements with landowners and developers where appropriate.

IMPLEMENTATION

4.28 These policies will be implemented as follows :

- a. The Council will use its development control powers to protect the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast from inappropriate development.
- b. In other areas of the Island, development will be required to respect local landscape type.
- c. When resources allow, the Council will prepare a revised and updated landscape strategy in consultation with the Countryside Council for Wales to :-
 - * classify landscape character;
 - * assess the likely impact of future land use changes on the landscape and how they can be accommodated;
 - * develop guidelines for determining applications in order to conserve and enhance features contributing to landscape character;
 - * highlight landscape priority areas for action.

ch. The Council will use Tree Preservation Orders to prevent the loss of trees which form attractive features in the landscape and which are under threat.

d. Ynys Môn has been designated an Environmentally Sensitive Area. An ESA is intended to safeguard areas of countryside where the landscape, wildlife or historic interest is of national importance. Farmers are able to get grants to manage land in the interests of these objectives.

dd. As part of proposals for land reclamation and environmental improvements set out in policy 38 below.

22) The Council did prepare “*a revised and updated landscape strategy in consultation with the Countryside Council for Wales*”, as stated in the Ynys Mon Local Plan 1996. **The Anglesey Landscape Strategy Update 2011** did briefly mention ‘Geological Management’ in respect of one of the Landscape Character Areas (Holyhead Mountain) but despite a detailed ‘evaluation matrix’ the Strategy fails to identify the unique qualities Ynys Mon has as a whole. Instead a matrix scores the most obvious geological features for each Landscape Character Area, according to a methodology that CCW used at that time to evaluate landscape areas in the whole of Wales. However the methodology missed the special and unique natural phenomenon that is the geology of the islands of Anglesey, and the Strategy offered no vision of how or why it was important to protect and enhance the Geopark.

23) By comparison, the simplicity of the concept and wording of paragraph 4.26 and Policy 31 in the Ynys Mon Local Plan does capture the significance of Anglesey’s special landscape and the need for developments to have regard to it.

24) During 2012 LUC prepared a **Review of Special Landscape Areas in Gwynedd and Anglesey** (final report dated December 2012) for the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU). This includes a Map of Gwynedd’s previous Landscape Conservation Areas, but there is no corresponding Map to illustrate the extent of Anglesey’s Special Landscape Area, as designated in the Ynys Môn Local Plan 1996. The LUC report justifies why Landscape Conservation Areas in Gwynedd should be designated SLAs but provides no such detailed, i.e. adequate, justification as to why the island-wide SLA designation should be removed from Anglesey. This is despite the fact that the proposed change to the Local Plan for Anglesey is evidently a much bigger change than is proposed to be made to the Local Plan for Gwynedd. The argument seems to be in paragraph 3.3 of the report, that there was no evidence to justify the inclusion of the designation within the stopped UDP

2005. However this argument is not based on an assessment of the facts known during 2012, and is in any case flawed as the stopped UDP counts only as a material consideration whereas the JLDP is intended to replace the Ynys Môn Local Plan 1996, which remains in full force until the JLDP is adopted.

25) Given the nature of Anglesey's AONB as described in paragraph 5 of this statement, and given the relationship between the AONB and other designated sites including GeoMon, it is important to carefully consider those areas of Anglesey's landscape that provide a buffer to protect views into and out of the AONB. The LUC report recognises this and notes the special need for a Menai buffer. However paragraph 1.4 explains:- **The UDP had elected not to identify Special Landscape Areas on the island.** And this effectively pre-judges and prescribes the evaluation process and is used as the basis for the parameters of the Search Areas. Conversely considerable time and attention was paid to landscapes in Gwynedd. Unfortunately, because of the reliance on the decision taken during the UDP process, insufficient attention was paid to the geological landscape, and the Landmap data did not provide the information either, as is evident from the table on page 8 of the LUC report. The LUC report carefully examines Gwynedd's Landscape Conservation Areas and where it does not recommend them for SLA designation it is because the area already has some other designation such as Grade 1 Registered Parkland or is designated as a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Importance and is part of a bid for World Heritage Site status. By comparison no similar assessment is made of Anglesey and the report makes no mention of the European Geopark or its bid for Global Geopark status. It is clear then that the SA and SEA should be revisited, in respect of both the GeoMon designation and the SLA, in relation to Anglesey.

26) LUC claims to have undertaken "a thorough field verification exercise" (page 3 paragraph 2.3) and yet it appears not to have discovered the European Geopark nor realised, in this context at least, the full significance of **Table 2.2.1 LANDMAP evaluation scores** in its own report. This table quite clearly states that internationally important sites must be scored "**Outstanding**".

27) There are other anomalies or mistakes in LUC's evaluation and assessment of the data, for example Llansadwrn is identified as being part of the 'Landmap aspect area' for the Beaumaris Wooded Slopes & Llangoed Vale SLA. Llansadwrn fulfils all the SLA designation criteria. The rural village is situated on high ground, part ridgeline (extending towards Llanddona and the AONB) and part plateau at the head of Cwm Cadnant valley. The whole area is an important backdrop to the Menai and the AONB. There are continuous

extensive views to Snowdonia National Park and in places the views are panoramic including towards Red Wharf Bay. It is an area associated with renowned artists such as Kyffin Williams. Ed Povey lived for many years at Arcady, near St Sadwrn church. This unusual house has far-reaching panoramic views and has become a local landmark:-

<http://www.walesonline.co.uk/news/wales-news/most-artistic-home-wales-2373096>

The summer house Hafoty, was built for its exceptional views in an earlier era. It is now in CADW's care. It still enjoys a fine tranquil setting and stunning views. Indeed this whole area is rich in historic and archaeological features set in a landscape that ranges from exposed ridges with rocky outcrops to pastoral stone bounded fields and small sheltered valleys and undulations. There is a high proportion of woodland, comprising both ancient copse and tree lined lanes and also the river and millponds and a Wildlife Nature Reserve at Llandegfan. Llansadwrn is the only area within the SLA 'aspect area' which scores 4 'Outstanding' points on the matrix, yet it has been left off the SLA map. We presume the map was drawn incorrectly, using the wrong road as its boundary.

28) It is obvious that LUC had difficulty evaluating and making sense of the Landmap data (see paragraphs 2.16 -2.20), as the National Park and AONB designated landscapes did not emerge with very high scores. This should have alerted them to a problem that required more research and evidence. Instead LUC appears to have managed the data to produce a better fit so as to meet certain expectations and justify the generalised remarks made in paragraph 3.4. It is clear from paragraphs 3.3 and 3.4 that Anglesey's landscape received the most cursory evaluation and was quickly dismissed.

29) What is also evident is that the methodology employed by Landmap, of breaking up land mass areas into "discrete units or polygons", referred to as 'aspect areas' (page 4 paragraph 2.6) may be appropriate and indeed helpful for assessing very large land mass areas such as the rest of Wales, especially in the absence of an existing designation. But it is entirely inappropriate when it is the only methodology used for assessing a readily identifiable, unified and comparatively small Island with a very distinctive and unique landscape, culture and history. In this case the methodology, for all its usefulness, has also served to obfuscate the bigger picture.

30) Not only was LUC's evaluation of Anglesey inadequate, it was subjective in its choice of what was important data. It is difficult to avoid subjective judgements in planning matters, but to the naked eye it is obvious that Anglesey's landscape is a far more beautiful, geological and bio-diverse natural environment than many other areas in the UK that have AONB designation, compare for example, the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

What is clear is that at the very least **Anglesey fulfils all the criteria for SLAs** as set out in **Table 2.3** of the report. And in the light of its international designation and status the justification for an island-wide SLA goes beyond local need.

31) Unfortunately stakeholders could not scrutinize the LUC report as it was only available in Executive Summary form on the respective Council websites during consultation periods. The full report had to be requested at a later date from the JPPU. So the shortcomings, mistakes and omissions were not picked up during public consultation.

32) The simplicity of Policy 31 in the current Local Plan is that it deals with Anglesey's islands (i.e. Ynys Mon and its associated islands) as a whole and recognises the continuance of a special landscape extending from the AONB designated landscape into the landscape of Anglesey's interior countryside. However this concept of all Anglesey's landscape being 'special' has been lost in the formulation of the JLDP. Yet this is precisely what the Global Geopark designation recognises and in so doing UNESCO obliges us to adopt a "holistic approach" to safeguarding GeoMon.

33) The question now arises as to how to best rectify the glaring omission of the Deposit Plan's failure to properly address the existence of the Global Geopark?

34) To give effect to the UNESCO designation and ensure it has the proper weight in planning terms **Policy AMG1 – Special Landscape Area** could be amended to include protection criteria for the Geopark. This would restore SLA status to the whole of Anglesey and would also resolve the issue of the flawed public consultation and other errors and omissions.

Policy AMG1 should then be amended thus:-

POLICY AMG1: SPECIAL LANDSCAPE AREAS

When considering proposals within Special Landscape Areas (SLA) as identified by the proposals map and listed below, there will be a need to appropriately consider the scale and nature of the development thus ensuring that there is no detrimental impact on the landscape. The development should aim to add to the historic, visual, geographical, geological, ecological and cultural features of the SLA.

The following sentence should be added at the end of explanatory paragraph **7.5.9 ...Anglesey SLA is also a designated Global Geopark.**

The last sentence of explanatory paragraph 7.5.10 should be replaced with the following:-

7.5.10...10 SLA areas have been identified for Gwynedd, Anglesey is an SLA.

Table 24 should then be amended accordingly:-

11. Anglesey

The JPPU will then need to prepare a Statement of Significance and this can include the information referred to here in respect of the UNESCO designations and the unique cultural and environmental nature of Anglesey.

35) If on the other hand, GeoMon Global Geopark is not considered to be the basis for a de facto SLA then it will be necessary to **undertake a review of Anglesey's SLA.** It is clear that the review undertaken by LUC was too circumscribed in relation to Anglesey; paid too little attention to Anglesey; and undertook only limited fieldwork. Anglesey's island character has very different landscape and seascape to Gwynedd. The topography is of mostly gentle undulations and the aspect is more open and more sensitive to change. The criteria set for assessing landscape of local importance needs to take account of the difference and acknowledge that the particular local distinctiveness of Ynys Mon may require a different approach in order to achieve good sustainable development.

The contrast between Anglesey and Gwynedd is what makes this part of north Wales so distinctive and attractive, and when the two counties are envisioned as a whole it is a very special place.

36) The issue of the necessary statutory underpinning for GeoMon would then need to be dealt with separately by applying specific new policy supported by a revised SA and SEA.

Natural Environment Agenda item 5 – the Deposit Plan is unsound as it does not provide effective protection to the natural environment and fails to reflect the significance of international and national designations.

37) In the absence of changes as outlined above, the JLDP will not provide effective protection to Anglesey’s natural environment or reflect the relative significance of international, national and local designations.

The process of plan making and undertaking an SA and SEA is critical to the satisfactory identification and assessment of protected landscapes and sites of nature conservation. The failure to identify and assess the Global Geopark is the most obvious flaw in the Deposit Plan. But the assumptions made, together with the selection and manipulation of data in the LUC review goes beyond the issue of ignoring the totality of a landscape that has been awarded an international designation in recognition of its exceptional qualities. The report demonstrates that the evaluation of Anglesey’s landscape has not been sufficiently robust and should not be the basis of a plan for Ynys Mon.

Natural Environment Agenda item 8 Other Matters.

38) The purpose of consultation is to communicate with the public and to enable the public to inform the professionals tasked with the job of plan making of matters that are relevant to achieving good outcomes. UNESCO is a champion of this inclusive and bottom-up approach and it is in that spirit that I hope the planning professionals dealing with this Examination of the Local Plan will consider these comments.

PART 2: Your Comments and Suggested Changes. (Please use one Part 2 section for each comment that you wish to make)

2a. Which part of the Deposit Plan are you commenting on?	
Policy number (please specify)	AMG1
Paragraph number (please specify)	
Proposals/ Inset Map (please specify ref no.)	
Constraints Map	
Appendices (please specify)	

2b. Are you objecting or supporting the Deposit Plan?			
Objecting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Supporting	<input type="checkbox"/>

<p>2c. Please provide details of your representation on the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>In the Ynys Môn Local Development Plan 1996 section 31 on Landscape is the following: "4.26 The Council considers that all parts of Ynys Môn have special landscape qualities" (my emphasis)</p> <p>"31. With the exception of the AONB, and that land which falls within the settlement boundaries as defined in the Plan, the island is designated as a Special Landscape Area."</p> <p>Anglesey is indeed a special place. And yet in the new plan Special Landscape Area status is confined to a few areas of the island rather than the whole. Are the rest of the island's landscapes outside of the SLAs as apparently now designated not special. Why? What has changed? Is the island no longer special? The criteria now used to designate Special Landscape areas in this plan could equally apply in part or wholly to the island, as per the LDP 1996. The new policy is strange and unfounded. For instance the isle of Anglesey is recognised as a region of unique geological, environmental and cultural significance, both in the UK and internationally. There is a distinct possibility that UNESCO later this year will award Anglesey enhanced global geopark status, the equivalent status of a World Heritage Site.</p> <p>This Joint Local Plan is inadequate in not recognising the uniqueness of all Anglesey's landscapes and therefore does not offer sufficient protection to them against unsuitable developments and in that regard is unsound. It reverses longstanding policy without adequate justification, mandate or evidence.</p> <hr/> <p>2d. Please detail the changes you wish to see made to the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>AMG1 Anglesey as a whole to be designated a Special Landscape Area.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Please use additional sheet if necessary. Please state how many additional sheets have been used.....</i></p>
--

PART 2: Your Comments and Suggested Changes. (Please use one Part 2 section for each comment that you wish to make)

2a. Which part of the Deposit Plan are you commenting on?	
Policy number (please specify)	ADN1 ON-SHORE WIND ENERGY
Paragraph number (please specify)	7.2 (pages 84-86)
Proposals/ Inset Map (please specify ref no.)	N/A
Constraints Map	unreadable
Appendices (please specify)	N/A

2b. Are you objecting or supporting the Deposit Plan?			
Objecting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OBJECTING	Supporting	<input type="checkbox"/>

2c. Please provide details of your representation on the Deposit Plan.
<p>1. Policy ADN1 in the JLDP Deposit Plan is fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>2. The JLDP Preferred Strategy presented a generalised and non-specific plan for renewable energy. There was no indication given in the Preferred Strategy of the extraordinary wording and definitions that have emerged in the Deposit Plan under points 1, 2 and 3 of Policy ADN1.</p> <p>3. CPRW Ynys Mon strongly objects to the wording of Policy ADN1 points 1 and 2, which in the present form will lead to the destruction of the landscape character of central Anglesey.</p> <p>4. We also strongly object to ADN1 point 3, as this part of the policy would encourage the totally inappropriate development of 15 metre high wind turbines in what should be the most protected of landscapes, i.e. the AONB.</p> <p>5. CPRW Ynys Mon Branch expects that Anglesey's landscapes will be accorded, as a minimum, the same level of protection in the JLDP as is provided by the current Local Plan (Ynys Mon, Local Plan 1996).</p> <p>6. We did not expect a policy to emerge that would remove protection for landscape from almost the entire interior of the island. However this is what has emerged in Policy ADN1. The policy as worded combined with the definition given to turbine sizes makes it clear to prospective developers that there are few obstacles to inhibit the development of wind turbines of up to 50 metres in height anywhere in central Anglesey. And there is no limit to the number that could be built.</p> <p>7. Policy 31 of the Ynys Mon Local Plan 1996 designated the whole of Anglesey, outside of the AONB and settlement boundaries, a Special Landscape Area (SLA). This designation was agreed by the Inspector when the Plan was approved and it was a clear acknowledgment of the 'special' character and beauty of the island. Anglesey enjoys its reputation for being a 'special' place, and its special quality is admired far and wide. However the very 'essence' and 'heart' of this island is about to be lost as a result of one incredibly badly conceived planning policy.</p> <p>8. This error of judgement must be reversed. It must be recognised as a matter of urgency that with the exception of some newly industrialised areas, such as the wind farms in the north of the island,</p>

there has been no significant change to the character of the island's interior landscape since the designation was originally made. The removal of SLA status from the majority of the island's interior is simply not warranted. The SLA status should be re-instated for most of the island immediately, and the significance of the special character of the island's interior landscape should be reflected in the policies of this JLDP.

9. An ill-conceived policy for onshore wind energy must not be allowed to destroy the character and fabric of the island's interior.

10. We understand that in the early days of preparing the JLDP, the Planning Officer responsible for organising the work and progress of the JLDP undertook to prepare supplementary planning guidance for onshore wind energy. This was recorded in the minutes of the meeting of the Joint Planning Policy Committee on 17 June 2011. It was to be done in response to concerns about the impact of wind turbines. Those concerns were raised and discussed at the meeting.

11. As there has been no other consultation on Anglesey about on-shore wind energy during the JLDP process, we presume that the consultation for 'Supplementary Planning Guidance: On-Shore Wind Energy', which was undertaken on Anglesey during 2012, was the SPG referred to at the meeting on 17th June 2011.

12. As we know the 2012 SPG consultation provoked an unprecedented public response with some 9000 submissions from members of the public. The overwhelming response from Anglesey residents was to call for specific restrictions that would prevent any more large wind turbines being developed on the island.

13. 8000 residents signed a petition that called for no commercial wind turbines to be granted planning permission in the AONB or in the other designated areas, and for there to be a 1.5km buffer zone between any new commercial wind turbine developments and residences.

14. In January 2013 the County Councillors adopted the supplementary planning guidance after making a provision within it for buffer zones calculated on a sliding scale according to the size of turbine.

15. CPRW Ynys Mon supports the principle of buffer zones and height restrictions on wind turbine developments in Anglesey. We consider that the adopted SPG has helped to alleviate most people's concerns about wind turbines and generally speaking, it has helped to prevent inappropriate developments.

16. We are therefore dismayed to discover that the approach taken by Anglesey County Councillors has so easily been set-aside, that the adopted SPG has been ignored, and that the needs and wishes of the people of Anglesey have been disregarded. We believe this renders Policy ADN1 unsound.

17. CPRW Ynys Mon see no reason to alter the definition/ descriptions given to the physical size of turbines and increase the heights above height descriptions commonly used by the Welsh Government.

18. The documents used as part of the 2012 SPG consultation followed the Welsh Government guides and described the "typical" height range of:-

"Micro/domestic" turbines as 11 metres to blade tip";

"Small turbines as up to 20 metres to blade tip" and

"Medium turbines as 65 metres to blade tip".

19. The definitions of size presented for consultation in the 2012 documents is consistent with the size used in the Welsh Government's General Permitted Development Order for Stand Alone Wind Turbines, and with other planning policy references, guidance and literature about wind turbine technologies.

20. There is no justification for changing this terminology and no reason to introduce larger sizes into the JLDP.

21. We believe that Policy ADN1 is not consistent with Planning Policy Wales in a number of respects.

22. Policy ADN1 is not consistent with PPW Sustainable Development 12.8.1 as the policy does not *"enhance the economic, social and environmental wellbeing of the people and communities (of Anglesey or) achieve for them a better quality of life."*

23. Policy ADN1 does not have proper regard to the guidance in TAN8, which gives local Planning Authorities the discretion to adopt *"a set of local criteria that would determine the acceptability of such (sub SMW) schemes and define in more detail what is meant by "smaller" and "community based". Local planning authorities should give careful consideration to these issues and provide criteria that are appropriate to local circumstances."*

24. The list of criteria within Policy ADN1 does not include:-

a) the need to protect or safeguard the economic integrity of an area such as the need to safeguard landscape for the benefit of local employment in tourism and recreation. **This is a massive policy failure that would have alarming consequences for Anglesey, if it is not rectified.**

Policy 45 of Ynys Mon Local Plan, 1996 is as follows:-

Renewable energy projects will be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that there will not be any unacceptable impact on:-

- i) Landscape Character;***
- ii) Sites of international, national, or local importance for nature conservation;***
- iii) Species which are of nature conservation importance;***
- iv) The standard of amenity enjoyed by the resident and tourist population.***
- v) Essential Public Services and Communications.***

b) the need to safeguard productive agricultural land and woodland.

c) the need to safeguard wildlife habitats

d) the need to safeguard landscapes of cultural, archaeological and geological importance

e) the need to protect and conserve the plan area's natural resources

f) the need to create attractive, well designed places for the benefit of communities and for the future.

25. Policy ADN1 does not give due regard to the following TAN8 Guidance:-

2.13 Most areas outside SSAs should remain free of large wind power schemes. Local planning authorities may wish to consider the cumulative impact of small schemes in areas outside of the SSAs and establish suitable criteria for separation distances from each other and from the perimeter of existing wind power schemes or the SSAs. In these areas, there is a balance to be struck between the desirability of renewable energy and landscape protection. Whilst that balance should not result in severe restriction on the development of wind power capacity, there is a case for avoiding a situation where wind turbines are spread across the whole of a county.

Policy ADN1 is a policy which facilitates the prolific spread of wind turbines across the whole of the County of Anglesey.

26. Policy ADN1 does not fulfil PPW 12.8.6 being the "Welsh Government's aim to secure an appropriate mix of energy provision which maximises benefits to our economy and communities, whilst minimising potential environmental and social impacts".

27. Policy ADN1 fails to deliver PPW 12.8.8, as it does not "optimise renewable energy generation", within the Plan area because it fails to reach the optimum balance between the generation of energy by wind turbines and the local communities' need to make better use of the land to maximise in a genuinely sustainable manner the natural resource of the Plan area's productive land and soils, landscape, habitats and biodiversity, and sensory and environmental qualities, which contribute to the well-being and prosperity of local people.

28. Policy ADN1 fails in respect of PPW 12.8.10, which requires local planning authorities to "ensure that international and national statutory obligations to protect designated areas, species and habitats and the historic environment are observed".

29. Policy ADN1 fails to comply with PPW 12.9.3, as it has not established an evidence base which:
a) "takes into account the cumulative effects" of wind turbine developments across the entire island,
b) "takes into account the environmental, social and economic impacts" of facilitating wind turbine development across the entire island.

30. Policy ADN1 does not comply with PPW which states "development plans should....clearly set out the local criteria against which such proposals will be evaluated", as the list of criteria within the policy is incomplete and in some cases open to misinterpretation.

31. Policy ADN1 does not meet the criteria of managing and using land in the public interest and in a way which is consistent with key sustainability principles, so as to deliver integrated sustainable development outcomes, as intended by PPW 4.2.2, which states "The planning system provides for a presumption in favour of sustainable development to ensure that social, economic and environmental issues are balanced and integrated, at the same time, by the decision-taker when preparing a development plan."

32. And in conclusion Policy ADN1 fails in regard to PPW 4.3.1, which states "The following principles underpin our approach to planning policy for sustainable development and reflect those principles that we expect all those involved in the planning system to adhere to:

- putting people, and their quality of life now and in the future, at the centre of decision-making;
- engagement and involvement, ensuring that everyone has the chance to obtain information, see how decisions are made and take part in decision-making;
- taking a long term perspective to safeguard the interests of future generations, whilst at the same time meeting needs of people today;
- respect for environmental limits, so that resources are not irrecoverably depleted or the

environment irreversibly damaged. This means, for example, mitigating climate change, protecting and enhancing biodiversity, minimising harmful emissions, and promoting sustainable use of natural resources;"

For the above reasons Policy ADN1 of the JLDP is both a flawed policy for Anglesey and unsound.

7 sheets have been used.

y.

2ch. If your response to 2c above exceeds 100 words, please provide a summary (no more than 100 words).

Policy ADN1 is a flawed planning policy for Anglesey and is unsound.

2d. Please detail the changes you wish to see made to the Deposit Plan.

A policy that restricts the areas where new wind turbines can be built is essential for Anglesey. The SLA status must be restored to most of the island's interior landscape.

The heights of permissible new turbine developments must be reduced to those listed in the 2012 SPG Consultation.

There must be Buffer Zones between turbines and residential properties as per the 2013 SPG.

2dd. Is the Deposit Plan sound?

Yes

No

NO

2e. If you think that the Deposit Plan is unsound which test of soundness do you think that it fails?

Ymgyrch Diogelu Cymru Wledig
Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales
Elusen Gofrestredig/Registered Charity 239889



Cangen Ynys Môn/Anglesey Branch

c/o 25 Cae Cnyciog,
Llanfairpwll,
Anglesey,
LL61 5JS.

28th January 2016

Dr Gwynne Jones, Chief Executive/
Cllr Ieuan Williams, Leader, Anglesey County Council

Dear Dr Gwynne Jones and Cllr Ieuan Williams,

The incorrect assessment of Anglesey's Special Landscape Area within the JLDP Deposit Plan.

We are very concerned that the assessment of Anglesey's SLA during the Joint Local Development Plan process has been flawed.

We have traced the process through the published documents and we feel that insufficient attention has been paid to the legislative process and the selection criteria for the SLA on Anglesey.

We are concerned that there have been two fundamental flaws in the process as follows:-

1. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that Local Planning Authorities should, at the start of the plan making process, inform the stakeholder community of all the significant issues that will be considered and also highlight any significant changes that are being considered.

We can find no evidence that at the start of the JLDP process the public on Anglesey were clearly informed that the existing SLA policy (Policy 31 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan 1996) would be completely re-assessed.

Policy 31 is currently the legal basis for Anglesey's 'plan-led' planning decisions. The policy is simple and it is set out very clearly in the 1996 Plan as follows:-

"4.26 The Council considers that all parts of Ynys Môn have special landscape qualities. The conservation of natural beauty should be the overriding objective in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and along the Heritage Coast.

POLICY 31. LANDSCAPE

With the exception of the AONB, and that land which falls within the settlement boundaries as defined in the Plan, the island is designated as a Special Landscape Area. Proposals for development in the Special Landscape Area will be expected to have particular regard to the special character of their surroundings.

In considering the landscape impact of any proposal, the Council will need to be satisfied that the development can be fitted into its surroundings, without unacceptable harm to the general landscape character, before planning permission is granted."

The change proposed in the Deposit Plan published in 2015 reduces the SLA to 5 very small areas of land. Such a radical change, without proper public consultation from the outset, renders the Deposit Plan 2015 unsound.

2. The JLDP Unit has undertaken professional consultation. However this did not consider all the evidence as it was based only on incomplete LANDMAP evidence.

The Anglesey Landscape Strategy Update 2011 states:-

"TACP Consultants were appointed by Isle of Anglesey Council in April 2010 to undertake a review of the Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) identified within the original LANDMAP landscape assessment study for Anglesey published in 1999."

The SLA Report of 2012 also uses LANDMAP as the primary tool for evaluation of the SLA status for Anglesey.

However as Table 2.2 'Landmap and valuation scores' makes clear this tool is totally inadequate in respect of the evaluation of Geological Landscapes. See paragraph 2.12 on page 8 of the report:-

"Geological Landscape (5 questions + overall evaluation)
GL29a Research Value No information provided by LANDMAP
GL29b Educational Value No information provided by LANDMAP
GL30 Historical Value No information provided by LANDMAP
GL31 Rarity/uniqueness No information provided by LANDMAP
GL32 Classic example No information provided by LANDMAP
GL33 Overall evaluation
Overall evaluation for Geological Landscapes"

The report explains at paragraph 2.26:-

"This study developed and agreed three types of criteria to select areas for potential SLA designation. These criteria are considered in combination for each SLA: all areas will need to meet both of the two 'Practical Criteria' and at least one of the three 'Landscape Criteria'. A separate criterion is provided for those SLAs that will play a further important role in protecting/enhancing the setting of nationally protected landscapes (Snowdonia National Park and the Llyn and Anglesey AONBs). The criteria were carefully designed to ensure that areas designated as SLAs are done so based on clear need: the SLAs need to be 'special' and distinctive landscapes in their own right, whilst also meeting the overall strategic criteria of providing additional protection (above and beyond standard policy) to sensitive landscapes within the authority areas."

However LANDMAP does not provide the tools to assess the geology such an important aspect of Anglesey's heritage.

The report goes on to explain the extent of consultation at paragraph 2.30:-

"Consultation and verification
2.30 The findings from the field survey work were presented and discussed with the Steering Group at a meeting at the JPPU offices in Bangor. Following this meeting a written summary justification of areas deemed suitable for SLA designation was circulated, along with the maps of proposed SLAs. The Steering Group discussed these findings further with relevant officers within the two Councils, as well as the AONB teams. The JPPU also held a meeting with the Countryside Council for Wales's landscape architect to receive further professional opinion on the proposed designations."

"Finalising the proposed SLAs and preparing Statements of Value & Significance
2.33 Once the final selection of proposed SLAs was agreed, the boundaries were finalised in GIS and draft Statements of Value & Significance prepared. The draft statements were circulated to the Steering Group for further comment from both themselves and other council officers. A final

meeting was held at the JPPU headquarters to discuss the final drafts of the statements, which are included in Appendix 1 of this report."

It is therefore self-evident that the criteria used and set out in Table 2.3 of the report is incomplete and must be revised in the light of the UNESCO 'Global Geopark' geological designation given to Anglesey. This is equivalent in status to a World Heritage Site, and of course such sites are given a very high degree of protection within the plan making process.

As the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment, Final Report, produced by Gillespies, is also based on the earlier reports, and as Gillespies has not considered the UNESCO designation, that assessment is also incomplete and therefore flawed.

Anglesey has benefitted from the SLA protection it has enjoyed since 1996. The island landscapes are now recognised nationally and internationally as being unique. It would be wrong to remove or downgrade Anglesey's SLA status.

The fundamental importance of Policy 31 needs to be re-affirmed in the upcoming JLDP. The new plan should give appropriate recognition to the special qualities of the landscape character areas of Anglesey; the UNESCO Global Geopark status; and the interaction between the geology, landscapes and habitats.

Whether a 'fundamental change' or 'focused change' is required to re-insert Policy 31 into the JLDP is a matter for the Planning Officers. However the re-instatement of Policy 31 is, in our view, essential if the plan is to be considered sound. Therefore we do not consider it appropriate to submit the plan to the Welsh Government until this matter is resolved.

I would be grateful for your urgent reply,

Yours sincerely,



Dr Morag McGrath

cc. Councillor Members of the JLDP Committee.



CYNGOR SIR
YNYS MÔN
ISLE OF ANGLESEY
COUNTY COUNCIL

Uned Polisi Cynllunio ar y Cyd Gwynedd & Môn
Joint Planning Policy Unit Anglesey & Gwynedd

Morag McGrath
Chair, CPRW Anglesey Branch
c/o 25 Cae Cnyciog
Llanfairpwll
Anglesey
LL61 5JS

Uned Polisi Cynllunio ar y Cyd Gwynedd & Môn
Joint Planning Policy Unit Anglesey & Gwynedd
Llawr 1af Swyddfeydd Cyngor Dinas Bangor / 1st Floor
Bangor City Council Offices
Bangor
Gwynedd. LL57 IDT

☎ (01286) 679890

🌐 www.ynysmon.gov.uk

🌐 www.gwynedd.llyw.cymru

Gofynnwch am / Ask for: Nia Davies

☎ (01286) 679890

✉ planningpolicy@gwynedd.gov.uk

Ein Cyf / Our Ref:

Eich Cyf / Your Ref:

Dyddiad / Date: 16/02/2016

Dear Morag McGrath

Deposit Joint Local Development Plan – Special Landscape Areas

I refer to your letter dated 28th January 2016 addressed to Dr Gwynne Jones and Councillor Ieuan Williams regarding the above. I have been asked to respond on their behalf.

At the outset I consider it pertinent to refer to the status of the Special Landscape Areas in Anglesey. As referred to in your letter parts of the Island do currently benefit from Special Landscape Area designation in the Ynys Môn Local Plan, which was adopted in 1996.

However, following adoption of the Local Plan the Council began work on its Unitary Development Plan. Although this failed to reach the adoption stage, it did progress through the Public Inquiry stage and does carry weight as material planning consideration for development management purposes. The stopped Unitary Development Plan (2005) does not include a Special Landscape Area policy. Instead it sets a requirement to consider the character of the landscape within 15 broad landscape character areas. This approach was not challenged during the public consultation period about the Deposit Unitary Development Plan, and was considered to align with national planning policy. Therefore, the Isle of Anglesey County Council had already moved away from this type of local designation before work commenced on the Joint Local Development Plan.

I also draw your attention to Planning Policy Wales, to which the emerging Plan has to have regard. Paragraph 5.3.11 states that local designations such as special landscape areas should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the nature conservation, landscape or geological value of the site.

With the above in mind I shall respond to your queries in the order set out in your letter.

At the start of the Plan preparation process the Councils engaged with specific and general consultation bodies as well as the public regarding a schedule of potential issues, a potential vision for the Plan area and a schedule of potential objectives to be included in the emerging Plan. In accordance with the Regulations, the consultation bodies and the public's views were also requested about alternative growth and spatial options. The engagement involved publication of a document,

which was available to view and make comments on from November 2011 to the end of January 2012. The results of the engagement informed the decision about the Preferred Strategy document (also referred to as the Pre-Deposit proposals document). Council Members were kept informed about the emerging evidence base via a number of seminars. Information about the study regarding the direction of travel in terms of a special landscape area policy was presented to Members in October 2012.

Publication of the Preferred Strategy document provided the Councils with an opportunity to obtain views from consultation bodies' and the public's views about the emerging Plan before the full Plan (the Deposit Plan) was prepared. Public consultation about the Preferred Strategy document took place during May and June 2013. The Councils also published supporting documents so that readers would be familiar with the evidence base that would also inform the development of the Deposit Plan. The series of supporting documents included key information from the study that reviewed existing adopted special landscape areas within the Plan area. The study was commissioned in order to determine whether there was robust evidence (as is required in order to conform to national planning policy) to develop a Special Landscape Area policy within the emerging Plan. This report concluded that 5 areas on the Island merited designation as Special Landscape Areas.

Based on the evidence the Deposit Plan included Policy PS16, which is an overarching policy; Policy AMG 1, which deals with development within the identified Special Landscape Areas; and Policy AMG 2 which provides the framework to consider the impact of development on landscape character as defined by the landscape character areas.

I note that you are of the opinion that evaluation of the Island to determine the merits of designating special landscape areas is flawed.

LANDMAP is an all-Wales GIS based landscape resource where landscape characteristics, qualities and influences on the landscape are recorded and evaluated into a nationally consistent data set. Complete, quality assured, coverage of all five layers within each Authority was completed in 2008 thereby providing a nationally consistent resource for landscape planning and decision making.

There are five LANDMAP aspects, as follows:

- Geological Landscape
- Landscape Habitats
- Visual and Sensory
- Historic Landscape
- Cultural Landscape

Guidance notes for each aspect area were prepared by NRW which include questions that could help aspect specialists use to assess and collate information relevant to each aspect area. Descriptions/ notes were provided alongside most questions set out in the guidance notes. The questions and descriptions/ notes (where available) can be found in table 2.2 of the report about the study into the Special Landscape Areas. At the time of publishing the guidance notes no descriptions/ notes were provided for questions GL29 – GL33 in the Geological guidance note.

Natural Resources Wales (NRW) employed aspect specialists to assess and collate the information of **all 5 aspect areas** across the whole of Wales. This information can be found in a series of Collector Files (available on the NRW website). Therefore, despite the lack of description/ note to accompany the questions set out in the relevant guidance note, the geological aspect has been fully assessed by aspect specialists. The Collector Files for Anglesey and Gwynedd contain information on Research and Educational Value, Historical Value, Rarity/Uniqueness, Classic Example and Overall Evaluation. The consultants who undertook the study of Special Landscape Areas applied the information recorded in the Collector Files before reaching a conclusion. A summary of which can

be found in the Matrices of each Special Landscape Area in their Statements of Significance (1 = Research and Educational Value, 2= Historical Value, 3 = Rarity/Uniqueness, 4 = Classic Example and Overall Evaluation). Therefore it is incorrect to assume that the Geological Aspect of Anglesey's Landscape has not been fully assessed and taken into account within the SLA Report.

I trust the above clarifies the matters raised in your letter.

On the 29th January 2016, the Joint Planning Policy Committee decided that the Plan should now progress to the next stages in the preparation process, which are (i) consult about focussed changes to the Deposit Plan, and (ii) submit the Deposit Plan, an addendum that sets out the focussed changes, documents set out in the Regulations and all relevant supporting documents, as well as copies of every representation submitted during the public consultation about the Deposit Plan.

This will trigger the start of the Examination stage. Inspectors will be appointed shortly after submission of documents. The Examination Programme Officer will contact everyone in due course to advise them of details of the Examination, including any Hearing Sessions. Therefore, anyone who submitted an objection at the Deposit stage can either rely on the written evidence submitted at that stage or take part in the relevant Hearing Session (provided objectors have indicated that they wish to present evidence orally).

Yours sincerely



Nia H Davies
Planning Manager (Policy)

cc Councillor Ieuan Williams
cc Dr Gwynne Jones

We support these focussed changes because they improve the policy and are more consistent with the current Local Plan.

However it should be noted by the Planning Inspectorate that we believe that the proper process for redefining the SLA on Anglesey was not followed in respect of the relevant legislation and we have corresponded with the JLDP Unit and Anglesey County Council about this matter.

The policy as defined within the Deposit Plan takes no account of the Community Consultation or outcomes.

Defnyddiwch dudalennau ychwanegol os bydd angen.
Nodwch faint o dudalennau ychwanegol rydych wedi'u defnyddio.....
Please use additional sheet if necessary.
Please state how many additional sheets have been used.....

4. Os yw eich sylw yn 3 yn fwy na 100 o eiriau, darparwch grynodedb os gwelwch yn dda (dim mwy na 100 o eiriau.

4. If your response to 3 above exceeds 100 words, please provide a summary (no more than 100 words).

5. A ydych am i'ch sylwadau gael eu hystyried fel 'sylwadau ysgrifenedig' neu a hoffech siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad yn yr Archwiliad Cyhoeddus? (Ticiwch un o'r isod)

Ar y cam hwn, gallwch wneud sylwadau'n ysgrifenedig yn unig (gelwir y rhain yn 'sylwadau ysgrifenedig'). Fodd bynnag, gall pawb sydd am newid y Cynllun ymddangos gerbron yr Arolygydd a siarad mewn 'sesiwn gwrandawriad' yn ystod yr Archwiliad Cyhoeddus. Ond dylech gofio y bydd yr Arolygydd yn rhoi'r un pwysau ar eich sylwadau ysgrifenedig ar y ffurflen hon â'r rheiny a wneir ar lafar mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad. Sylwer, bydd yr Arolygydd yn dewis y weithdrefn fwyaf priodol er mwyn darparu ar gyfer y rhai sydd eisiau rhoi tystiolaeth lafar.

5. Do you want your comments to be considered by 'written representations' or do you want to speak at a hearing session of the Public Examination? (Please tick one of the following)

At this stage, you can only make comments in writing (these are called 'written representations'). However, everyone that wants to change the Plan can appear before and speak to the Inspector at a 'hearing session' during the Public Examination. But you should bear in mind that your written comments on this form will be given the same weight by the Inspector as those made verbally at a hearing session. Please note that the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure for accommodating those who want to provide oral evidence.

Nid wyf am siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad ac rwyf yn fodlon i'm sylwadau ysgrifenedig gael eu hystyried gan yr Arolygydd.

I do not want to speak at a hearing session and am happy for my written comments to be considered by the Inspector.

Hoffwn siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad.

I want to speak at a hearing session.

✓

6. Os hoffech siarad, cadarnhewch pam rydych yn ystyried ei bod hi'n angenrheidiol i chi siarad yn y Gwrandawriad.

6. If you wish to speak, please confirm which part of your representation you wish to speak to the Inspector about and why you consider it to be necessary to speak at the Hearing.

The lack of proper process in regard to redesigning Anglesey's SLA and particularly in respect of the impact that has had on Policy ADN1.

7. Os ydych am siarad, byddal'n ddefnyddiol pe gallech nodi ym mha iaith hoffech chi gael eich clywed? (Ticiwch un o'r isod)

6. If you wish to speak, it would be helpful if you could indicate in which language you would like to be heard. (Please tick one of the following boxes)

We support the ^{FOCUSSED CHANGE No. 83} focussed changes however they should reflect the fact that the SLA in Anglesey has been changed without following due process.

It is therefore an improvement to the policy AMG 1. However this policy will not be given full effect until it is based on the fact of having followed the relevant legislation and policy.

Defnyddiwch dudalennau ychwanegol os bydd angen.
Nodwch faint o dudalennau ychwanegol rydych wedi'u defnyddio.....
Please use additional sheet if necessary.
Please state how many additional sheets have been used.....

4. Os yw eich sylw yn 3 yn fwy na 100 o eiriau, darparwch grynodeb os gwelwch yn dda (dim mwy na 100 o eiriau).

4. If your response to 3 above exceeds 100 words, please provide a summary (no more than 100 words).

FOCUSSED CHANGE No: 83

5. A ydych am i'ch sylwadau gael eu hystyried fel 'sylwadau ysgrifenedig' neu a hoffech siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad yn yr Archwiliad Cyhoeddus? (Ticiwch un o'r isod)

Ar y cam hwn, gallwch wneud sylwadau'n ysgrifenedig yn unig (gelwir y rhain yn 'sylwadau ysgrifenedig'). Fodd bynnag, gall pawb sydd am newid y Cynllun ymddangos gerbron yr Arolygydd a siarad mewn 'sesiwn gwrandawriad' yn ystod yr Archwiliad Cyhoeddus. Ond dylech gofio y bydd yr Arolygydd yn rhoi'r un pwysau ar eich sylwadau ysgrifenedig ar y ffurflen hon â'r rheiny a wneir ar lafar mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad. Sylwer, bydd yr Arolygydd yn dewis y weithdrefn fwyaf priodol er mwyn darparu ar gyfer y rhai sydd eisiau rhoi tystiolaeth lafar.

5. Do you want your comments to be considered by 'written representations' or do you want to speak at a hearing session of the Public Examination? (Please tick one of the following)

At this stage, you can only make comments in writing (these are called 'written representations'). However, everyone that wants to change the Plan can appear before and speak to the Inspector at a 'hearing session' during the Public Examination. But you should bear in mind that your written comments on this form will be given the same weight by the Inspector as those made verbally at a hearing session. Please note that the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure for accommodating those who want to provide oral evidence.

Nid wyf am siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad ac rwyf yn fodlon i'm sylwadau ysgrifenedig gael eu hystyried gan yr Arolygydd.

I do not want to speak at a hearing session and am happy for my written comments to be considered by the Inspector.

Hoffwn siarad mewn sesiwn gwrandawriad.

I want to speak at a hearing session.

6. Os hoffech siarad, cadarnhewch pam rydych yn ystyried ei bod hi'n angenrheidiol i chi siarad yn y Gwrandawriad.

6. If you wish to speak, please confirm which part of your representation you wish to speak to the Inspector about and why you consider it to be necessary to speak at the Hearing.

The failure to follow due process and law when defining the SLA in Anglesey.

7. Os ydych am siarad, byddai'n ddefnyddiol pe gallech nodi ym mha iaith hoffech chi gael eich clywed? (Ticiwch un o'r isod)

6. If you wish to speak, it would be helpful if you could indicate in which language you would like to be heard. (Please tick one of the following boxes)

Hoffwn i gael fy nghlywed yn Gymraeg
I wish to be heard in Welsh

Hoffwn i gael fy nghlywed yn Saesneg
I wish to be heard in English

DIOLCH AM EICH SYLWADAU AM Y NEWIDIADAU Â FFOCWS/ THANK YOU FOR YOUR COMMENTS ON THE FOCUSSED CHANGES