

## **Hearing Session 14**

# **ALLOCATIONS AND ALTERNATIVE SITES: ANGLESEY - NORTH**

**9.30 am, Tuesday 4 October 2016**

**Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint  
Local Development Plan**



**CYNGOR SIR  
YNYS MÔN  
ISLE OF ANGLESEY  
COUNTY COUNCIL**

This Statement has been produced by the Isle of Anglesey County Council and Gwynedd Council to set out their response to the matters and issues raised by the Inspector for the Hearing relating to Allocations and Alternative Sites in north Anglesey in the submitted Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan.

This Statement relates to the elements of the Plan that have been raised by the Inspector as matters to be discussed. Where appropriate the Statement draws on and cross-refers to the main sources of information used in the preparation of the Plan such as the outcomes of public consultation, the Sustainability Appraisal, the Background Documents and the supporting Topic Papers. Document reference numbers are given where appropriate.

For the purpose of clarity within this statement any Matters Arising Changes suggested to the Deposit Plan and/or a Focussed Change to the Plan, is shown in bold **Red** and underlined. Any Focussed Change text to the Deposit Plan is shown in **Bold** underlined text.

## AMLWCH

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- **Candidate Site SP378 - Land at Cae Syr Rhys, Amlwch**
- **Rep ID: 1395 (Mr Lloyd Williams 2838 c/o Jon Power, HOW Planning 3309)**

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	Greenfield site which lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes to include the site within the development boundary for residential purposes as an extension of housing allocation T10.
<b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	5.8ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 174 dwellings.
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.  Issues raised during the Candidate Site Assessment processed highlighted the inadequate visibility at the junction with the A5025 and capacity of Lôn Bach.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated</b>	No. The Deposit Plan and its supporting documents, which includes an Urban Capacity Study (Topic Paper 6, PT.0013), clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Amlwch to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification to include this land within the development boundary.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision for housing development within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Amlwch to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound. Therefore, It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p>site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</p>	<p>demonstrate.</p>
<p><b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLI.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- **Candidate Site SP333 - Land at Rhos Place, Amlwch**
- **Rep ID: 1201 (Dafydd Ioan Hughes 2083)**

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	Greenfield site which is lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor considers it an ideal "alternative site" for housing.
<b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	1.47ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 44 dwellings.
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.</p> <p>The majority of the site falls within a C2 flood risk zone which is a major constraint to development. No flood risk consequences assessment has been submitted by the resopner to support his application.</p>
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	No. The majority of site is within a C2 flood risk zone. The Deposit Plan and its supporting documents, which includes an Urban Capacity Study (Topic Paper 6, PT.0013), clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Amlwch to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification to include this land within the development boundary.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision for housing development within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Amlwch to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound. Therefore, It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site</b>	Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b></p>	<p>robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLI.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

## HOLYHEAD

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Not site specific
- Rep ID: 657 (Robert Llywelyn Jones 3058)

- The objector wishes to include terraced housing in Holyhead and the rest of the island within the Plan as a means of modernising housing stock.

Response:

- 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 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.
- Plans related to the Holyhead Regeneration Area will be able to promote opportunities that will achieve the objectives to regenerate Holyhead.
- There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- **Land at Holyhead Port, Holyhead**
- **Rep ID: 829 (Robert Llywelyn Jones 3058)**

QUESTION	COUNCILS’ RESPONSE
<b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	The area of land forms part of Holyhead Port and lies within the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes for the employment allocation on the site to be deleted and for the Plan to retain the site as a public open space.
<b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	The safeguarded reserve employment site measures 41.9 hectares.
<b>ch) Are there any significant</b>	Not applicable since the representation does not refer to a proposed use.

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	The site has been specifically safeguarded as a reserve employment site which should only be brought forward for development connected to the Energy Island Programme. Before consideration can be given to releasing the land for employment use, need would have to be demonstrated plus evidence that the proposed development on the site is directly related to realising the objectives of the Energy Island Programme and that there was no suitable protected employment site to meet the need. The timescale for the delivery of the site is therefore dependent upon the Energy Island Programme being realised.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	Yes. The site is necessary to ensure that the transformational economic benefit of the Energy Island Programme can be realised.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	It is considered that the LDP meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	Not applicable since the representation does not refer to a proposed use.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>



QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>Not applicable since the representation does not refer to a proposed use.</p>

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Land at Holyhead Port, Holyhead
- Rep ID: 1382 [Conygar Stenaline Ltd (3304) c/o John Adshead (222)]

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b></p>	<p>The area of land forms part of Holyhead port and lies within the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor requests a 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><b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b></p>	<p>41.9ha</p>
<p><b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b></p>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the amendment of this site, it is for the representor to demonstrate that without the changes the site is not deliverable.</p>
<p><b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b></p>	<p>The Plan allocates three sites specifically as reserve sites relating to the Energy Island Programme</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	<p>(Including Holyhead Port). As stated in in Policy CYF1 before consideration can be given to releasing these lands for employment purposes, need would have to be demonstrated, along with evidence that the proposed development on the site is directly related to realising the objectives of the Energy Island Programme and that there are no other suitable safeguarded/allocated employment sites that could meet this need.</p>
<p><b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b></p>	<p>Yes. There are currently a number of private sector developers proposing to develop low carbon renewable major energy projects on Anglesey. The Isle of Anglesey County Council see the development of these major projects as key in transforming the Island's economy for the future and providing a sustainable long-term high quality of life for Anglesey's residents.</p> <p>It is imperative that the Plan can accommodate for developments along with any foreseen associated and supply chain developments relating to the Energy Island Programme and the allocated sites reflect a degree of flexibility in relation to the site selection process.</p> <p>This approach aligns with the findings of the Employment Land Review (DC.004).</p>
<p><b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b></p>	<p>Yes, the employment allocations and their use classes are supported by the Plan's evidence base. It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to amend the status of the allocation in the Plan.</p>
<p><b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b></p>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the amendment to this site this is for the representor to demonstrate.</p>
<p><b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	<p>between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>The Employment Land Review (DC.004) assessed the suitability of each employment site to assess the likelihood that the sites would be developed within the Plan period. Following the assessment of the sites suitability (based upon locational and infrastructure factors) the sites were divided into prime and secondary sites. The prime sites are those thought to be most attractive to the market and are more likely to be developed in the short term. Secondary sites may be in inferior locations in terms of access/market presence compared with prime sites but they retain an important role as they represent opportunities that are highly relevant to the Energy Island Programme or serve a local need in more remote or rural areas. Within the Employment Land Review Holyhead Port site has been recognised as a secondary Employment Site.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the amendments to the site it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p> <p>This site is being supported by the Councils. All allocations have been assessed against the SA Framework found in the Sustainability Appraisal (Feb 2016) (CDLL.007).</p>

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- **Holyhead Waterfront Site, Holyhead**
- **Rep ID: 1830 [Conygar Stenaline Ltd (3373) c/o John Adshead (3374)]**

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	The objector wishes to amend the development boundary of Holyhead and to extend housing allocation T16 to include the entire Waterfront site in accordance with the extant outline planning permission. The Deposit Plan allocates the outline planning permission that is based within the mean high water mark.
<b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	<p>No. The majority of the residential units approved are located beyond the mean high water mark and the allocation reflects the units with permission on land. We do not propose to extend the housing allocation over the sea.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan and its supporting documents, which includes an Urban Capacity Study (Topic Paper 6, PT.0013), clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Holyhead to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification to include this land within the development boundary.</p>
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision for housing development within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Holyhead to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound. Therefore, It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate that housing allocation T16 should be extended.

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
and strategic objectives of the Plan?	
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b>	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- T12 - Land near Cae Rhos, Holyhead

- Rep ID: 387, 402 (Mr Dave Eccles 269)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	The site lies within the Deposit Plan development boundary and allocated for housing. The representor seeks the deletion of the housing allocation T12 within the Deposit Plan.
<b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	1.75ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 53 dwellings.
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	<p>The Councils are of the opinion that the site is deliverable and that there are no insurmountable infrastructure or other constraints that would hinder the development of the site within the Plan period. Delivery of the site is not reliant on any strategic infrastructure projects and the Plan's policies set out how potential impacts of the development of the site can be managed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Plan includes a 10% slippage allowance and therefore the Councils consider there to be sufficient flexibility within the Plan.</p> <p>The delivery of housing will be monitored in the Annual Monitoring Reporting process using the data obtained through the Joint Housing Land Availability Studies. The monitoring framework will therefore identify areas where there may be a need to consider any actions in order to facilitate the delivery of sites, potential plan or policy reviews, including any site allocations where significant Plan deliverability issues arise.</p>
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	Please refer to Annex 1, Schedule of Sites in Topic Paper 20A: Housing Trajectory (DC.023)
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	Yes. During the Plan preparation process, an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period has been collated. The sites allocated within the Plan are deliverable within the Plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing need of the Plan area up to 2026.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	Yes. During the Plan preparation process, an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period has been collated. The sites allocated within the Plan are deliverable within the Plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing need of the Plan area up to 2026.

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b></p>	<p>This site is being supported by the Councils in accordance with the Plan's Spatial Strategy. The Plan's Spatial Strategy means that 55% of the overall housing land requirement identified for the Plan area is directed to the Sub-regional Centre and Urban Service Centres because these are the largest settlement in the Plan area where there are concentrations of facilities, employment opportunities and transport options.</p>
<p><b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>The Councils are therefore of the opinion that the site's inclusion within the development boundary and its allocation is founded on application of a robust and credible assessment methodology.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>This site is being supported by the Councils. All allocations have been assessed against the SA Framework found in the Sustainability Appraisal (Feb 2016) (CDLL.007).</p>

a) **Site Reference / Name:**

- T13 - Land near Yr Ogof, Holyhead
- Rep ID: 389 (Mr Dave Eccles 269)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
b) <b>What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	The site lies within the Deposit Plan development boundary and allocated for housing. The representor seeks the deletion of the housing allocation T13 within the Deposit Plan.
c) <b>What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	2.4 ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 72 dwellings.
ch) <b>Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	<p>The Councils are of the opinion that the site is deliverable and that there are no insurmountable infrastructure or other constraints that would hinder the development of the site within the Plan period. Delivery of the site is not reliant on any strategic infrastructure projects and the Plan's policies set out how potential impacts of the development of the site can be managed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Plan includes a 10% slippage allowance and therefore the Councils consider there to be sufficient flexibility within the Plan.</p> <p>The delivery of housing will be monitored in the Annual Monitoring Reporting process using the data obtained through the Joint Housing Land Availability Studies. The monitoring framework will therefore identify areas where there may be a need to consider any actions in order to facilitate the delivery of sites, potential plan or policy reviews, including any site allocations where significant Plan deliverability issues arise.</p>
d) <b>What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	Please refer to Annex 1, Schedule of Sites in Topic Paper 20A: Housing Trajectory (CDLL.023)
dd) <b>Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	Yes. During the Plan preparation process, an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period has been collated. The sites allocated within the Plan are deliverable within the Plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing need of the Plan area up to 2026.



QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b></p>	<p>Yes. During the Plan preparation process, an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period has been collated. The sites allocated within the Plan are deliverable within the Plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing need of the Plan area up to 2026.</p>
<p><b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b></p>	<p>This site is being supported by the Councils in accordance with the Plan's Spatial Strategy. The Plan's Spatial Strategy means that 55% of the overall housing land requirement identified for the Plan area is directed to the Sub-regional Centre and Urban Service Centres because these are the largest settlement in the Plan area where there are concentrations of facilities, employment opportunities and transport options.</p>
<p><b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>The Councils are therefore of the opinion that the site's inclusion within the development boundary and its allocation is founded on application of a robust and credible assessment methodology.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the</b></p>	<p>This site is being supported by the Councils. All allocations have been assessed against the SA Framework found in the Sustainability Appraisal (Feb 2016) (CDLL.007).</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?	

## BODEDERN

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Land at Sarn Gannu, Bodedern (SP59)
- Rep ID: 1282 (Dr Cledwyn Hughes 129 c/o Rhys Davies, Cadnant Planning 1366)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	Greenfield site which is lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes to include the site within the development boundary and link it with allocation T34 to provide a comprehensive housing allocation for residential purposes.
<b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	3.31ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 99 dwellings.
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement</b>	No. The Deposit Plan and its supporting documents, which includes an Urban Capacity Study (Topic Paper 6, PT.0013), clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	landbank provision within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Bodedern to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification to include this land within the development boundary.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision for housing development within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Bodedern to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound. Therefore, It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental</b>	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	

## CEMAES

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes
- Rep ID: 1823 (Mr Thomas Conway 3371)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b></p>	<p>The site lies within the Deposit Plan development boundary and allocated for housing. The representor seeks the deletion of the housing allocation T35 within the Deposit Plan.</p>
<p><b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b></p>	<p>2ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 60 dwellings.</p>
<p><b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b></p>	<p>The Councils are of the opinion that the site is deliverable and that there are no insurmountable infrastructure or other constraints that would hinder the development of the site within the Plan period. Delivery of the site is not reliant on any strategic infrastructure projects and the Plan's policies set out how potential impacts of the development of the site can be managed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Plan includes a 10% slippage allowance and therefore the Councils consider there to be sufficient flexibility within the Plan.</p> <p>The delivery of housing will be monitored in the Annual Monitoring Reporting process using the data</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	obtained through the Joint Housing Land Availability Studies. The monitoring framework will therefore identify areas where there may be a need to consider any actions in order to facilitate the delivery of sites, potential plan or policy reviews, including any site allocations where significant Plan deliverability issues arise.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	Please refer to Annex 1, Schedule of Sites in Topic Paper 20A: Housing Trajectory (CDLL.023)
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	Yes. During the Plan preparation process, an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period has been collated. The sites allocated within the Plan are deliverable within the Plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing need of the Plan area up to 2026.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	Yes. During the Plan preparation process, an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period has been collated. The sites allocated within the Plan are deliverable within the Plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing need of the Plan area up to 2026.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	This site is being supported by the Councils in accordance with the Plan's Spatial Strategy. The Plan's Spatial Strategy means that 55% of the overall housing land requirement identified for the Plan area is directed to the Sub-regional Centre and Urban Service Centres and 20% in Local Service Centres because these are the largest settlement in the Plan area where there are concentrations of facilities, employment opportunities and transport options.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	<p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>The Councils are therefore of the opinion that the site's inclusion within the development boundary and its allocation is founded on application of a robust and credible assessment methodology.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>This site is being supported by the Councils. All allocations have been assessed against the SA Framework found in the Sustainability Appraisal (Feb 2016) (CDLL.007).</p>

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Land at Manora, Cemaes
- Rep ID: 1825 (Mr Thomas Conway 3371)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b></p>	<p>Greenfield site which lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes to include the site within the development boundary and allocate it for housing.</p>
<p><b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b></p>	<p>1.4ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 42 dwellings.</p>
<p><b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the</b></p>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	There are highway constraint connected to the land due to poor accessibility. The land is also safeguarded as Grade 3 Best and Most Versatile Agricultural Land.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	No. The Deposit Plan and its supporting documents, which includes an Urban Capacity Study (Topic Paper 6, PT.0013), clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Cemaes to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification to include this land within the development boundary.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision for housing development within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Cemaes to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound. Therefore, It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.
<b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b>	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Land adjacent to Hafod, Cemaes
- Rep ID: 1826 (Mr Thomas Conway 3371)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	Greenfield site which is lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes to include the site within the development boundary and allocate it for housing.
<b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	0.2ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 6 dwellings.
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.
<b>d) What are the anticipated</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to



QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>timescales for delivery?</b>	demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	No. The Deposit Plan and its supporting documents, which includes an Urban Capacity Study (Topic Paper 6, PT.0013), clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Cemaes to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification to include this land within the development boundary.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision for housing development within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Cemaes to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound. Therefore, It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been</b>	A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.

a) Site Reference / Name:

- Former Faraway Site, Cemaes
- Rep ID: 1827 (Mr Thomas Conway 3371)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?	Greenfield site which lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes to include the site within the development boundary and allocate it for housing.
c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?	0.32ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 10 dwellings.
ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.
d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
dd) Should the site be included	No. The Deposit Plan and its supporting documents, which includes an Urban Capacity Study (Topic Paper

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	6, PT.0013), clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Cemaes to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification to include this land within the development boundary.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision for housing development within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Cemaes to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound. Therefore, It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal /</b>	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- T35 - Land to rear of Holyhead Road, Cemaes
- Rep ID: 1300 (Cyngor Cymuned Llanbadrig 1375)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b></p>	<p>The site lies within the Deposit Plan development boundary and allocated for housing. The representor seeks the deletion of the housing allocation T35 within the Deposit Plan.</p>
<p><b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b></p>	<p>2ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 60 dwellings.</p>
<p><b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b></p>	<p>The Councils are of the opinion that the site is deliverable and that there are no insurmountable infrastructure or other constraints that would hinder the development of the site within the Plan period. Delivery of the site is not reliant on any strategic infrastructure projects and the Plan's policies set out how potential impacts of the development of the site can be managed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Plan includes a 10% slippage allowance and therefore the Councils consider there to be sufficient flexibility within the Plan.</p> <p>The delivery of housing will be monitored in the Annual Monitoring Reporting process using the data obtained through the Joint Housing Land Availability Studies. The monitoring framework will therefore</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	identify areas where there may be a need to consider any actions in order to facilitate the delivery of sites, potential plan or policy reviews, including any site allocations where significant Plan deliverability issues arise.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	Please refer to Annex 1, Schedule of Sites in Topic Paper 20A: Housing Trajectory (CDLL.023)
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	Yes. During the Plan preparation process, an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period has been collated. The sites allocated within the Plan are deliverable within the Plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing need of the Plan area up to 2026.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	Yes. During the Plan preparation process, an extensive range of supporting evidence that demonstrates the housing requirement over the JLDP period has been collated. The sites allocated within the Plan are deliverable within the Plan period to enable the JLDP to meet the identified housing need of the Plan area up to 2026.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	This site is being supported by the Councils in accordance with the Plan's Spatial Strategy. The Plan's Spatial Strategy means that 55% of the overall housing land requirement identified for the Plan area is directed to the Sub-regional Centre and Urban Service Centres because these are the largest settlement in the Plan area where there are concentrations of facilities, employment opportunities and transport options.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	<p>assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>The Councils are therefore of the opinion that the site's inclusion within the development boundary and its allocation is founded on application of a robust and credible assessment methodology.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>This site is being supported by the Councils. All allocations have been assessed against the SA Framework found in the Sustainability Appraisal (Feb 2016) (CDLL.007).</p>

## LLANERCHYMEDD

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Land adjacent to Eithinog, Llanerchymedd (SP615)
- Rep ID: 1389 (Mr Elwyn Schofield 3306 c/o Cadnant Planning 1366)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b></p>	<p>Greenfield site which lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes to include the site within the development boundary and allocate it for housing.</p>
<p><b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b></p>	<p>0.33ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 10 dwellings.</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	No. The Deposit Plan and its supporting documents, which includes an Urban Capacity Study (Topic Paper 6, PT.0013), clearly demonstrates that there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Llanerchymedd to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Therefore, it is considered that there is no justification to include this land within the development boundary.
<b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, there is sufficient land allocated, windfall opportunities and a landbank provision for housing development within the Deposit Plan Development Boundary for Llanerchymedd to meet the housing need identified in the Plan. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound. Therefore, It is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	<p>internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

## LLANFAETHLU

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Land to the north of Bryn Llwyd Estate, Llanfaethlu
- Rep ID: 920 (Tom Carpenter 2863 c/o Cadnant Planning 1366)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b></p>	<p>Greenfield site which is lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes to include the site within the development boundary for residential purposes.</p>
<p><b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b></p>	<p>10.24 - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 307 dwellings.</p>



QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	No. 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>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
	assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.
g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

## MOELFRE

a) Site Reference / Name:

- Land adj Ystant Nant Bychan, Moelfre (SP774)
- Rep ID: 1158 (Rhys Davies, Cadnant Planning 1366)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?	Greenfield site which lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor proposes the site to be included within the development boundary for housing.
c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?	2.63ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 79 dwellings.
ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	No. 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>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been</b>	A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?</b></p>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Garden curtilage of Cocyn Uchaf, Moelfre
- Rep ID: 1259 (Neil Fairburn 3290)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b></p>	<p>Greenfield site which lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor wishes to include the site within the development boundary.</p>
<p><b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b></p>	<p>0.28ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 8 dwellings.</p>
<p><b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b></p>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.</p>
<p><b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b></p>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.</p>
<p><b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement</b></p>	<p>No. Development boundaries are drawn around the urban form of settlements. The site in question is not considered to be part of the Moelfre's urban form. It is considered that the Deposit Plan identifies</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	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>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b>	No, it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound.
<b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that</b>	A sustainability appraisal hasn't been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal. As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?	

## TREARDDUR

**a) Site Reference / Name:**

- Land adj Timant, Trearddur (SP772)
- Rep ID: 1161 (Rhys Davies, Cadnant Planning 1366)

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<b>b) What is the current status / use of the site and what is the proposed use?</b>	Greenfield site which is lies outside the Deposit Plan development boundary. The representor proposes the site to be included within the development boundary for housing.
<b>c) What is the size of the site and what scale / numbers of units are proposed?</b>	1.91ha - Based on the JLDP guidelines of 30 dwellings per hectare the site could accommodate 57 dwellings.
<b>ch) Are there any significant obstacles to the development of the site within the Plan period?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, it is for the representor to demonstrate that the site is ultimately deliverable.
<b>d) What are the anticipated timescales for delivery?</b>	As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan, this is for the representor to demonstrate.
<b>dd) Should the site be included within the settlement boundary and /or be allocated?</b>	No. 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.

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
<p><b>e) Is the site necessary to ensure that the LDP is sound?</b></p>	<p>No, it is considered that the Plan meets the tests of soundness without the need for a different approach or alternative sites to deliver the evidenced need. Having considered the policy context, Plan strategy and other relevant material factors, it is considered there is no demonstrable need to include the site in the Plan and the inclusion of the alternative site is not considered necessary to ensure that Plan LDP is sound.</p>
<p><b>f) How would the alternative site contribute to the aims and strategic objectives of the Plan?</b></p>	<p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan this is for the representor to demonstrate.</p>
<p><b>ff) Is the Council's site selection process reasonable and appropriate and is it founded on a robust and credible evidence base?</b></p>	<p>Yes. The Council's site selection process is considered reasonable and appropriate and founded on a robust and credible evidence base. As part of the earlier evidence gathering stages the Council invited interested parties to submit Candidate Sites to provide an indication of sites available for development. Details of the Candidate Sites submitted are contained in the Candidate Site Register (CDLL.002) The methodology for assessing the suitability of candidate sites can be found in Topic Paper 1 (PT.001) and contains a robust 3 step process to assess the suitability of the sites.</p> <p>The Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) consulted on the methodology for assessing the Candidate Site between 18<sup>th</sup> August and 15<sup>th</sup> September 2011 which included engagement with statutory consultees and internal Council departments. The summary of the main issues raised and Councils' response can be found in Topic Paper 1A (PT.002).</p> <p>The site selection methodology clearly demonstrates the interrelationship between the candidate site assessment and SA appraisal of the options explored in the Deposit Plan.</p>
<p><b>g) Has the alternative allocation sought been considered in respect of the Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment? Would the change be likely to have significant effects that require re-assessment? If so, has such an assessment</b></p>	<p>A sustainability appraisal has been submitted by the objector in support of this proposal.</p> <p>As the Councils are not promoting the site for inclusion in the Plan it is for the representor to demonstrate alignment with the SA/ SEA.</p>

QUESTION	COUNCILS' RESPONSE
been carried out? What was the outcome of the process?	

## NEW CLUSTER

### Site Reference / Name:

- **Not site specific**
- **Rep ID: 1803 (Peter Day 2013)**
- The representor wishes for a new cluster to be known as the 'Moranedd' be included within the Plan.
- 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 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.
- 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.
- There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.