

## APPENDIX A – CHAPTER 7.1 SAFE, HEALTHY, DISTINCTIVE AND VIBRANT COMMUNITIES

### Welsh Language and Culture

#### PS1 – Welsh Language and Culture

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
	Loftus) [2719]				<b>No change</b>
125	Cyngor Cymuned Llanystumdwy (Mr Richard J Roberts) [1550]	PS1	Support	2 states that proposals that cause significant harm to the character and linguistic balance of communities due to their size, scale or location will be refused and 4 promotes the use of welsh place names for new development, house names and street names. We fully support these policies.	<b>Supportive comment noted</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>
127	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	PS1	Object	<p>Point 2 is considered over onerous and requires further clarification. Such impact would need to be tested and assessed this would normally be done through some form of 'impact assessment'. The policy should instead set thresholds above which an assessment is required. The words 'size &amp; scale' need to be quantified. In setting a threshold for residential development care needs to be taken to not set it too low as this will discourage smaller builders due to the extra work and cost associated with new development.</p> <p>Delete point 2 or reword to provide clarification as above.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> - The Welsh language has been considered when formulating the strategy and policies of the Plan, and the possible effects of the Plan on the Welsh language have been assessed throughout the Sustainability Assessment process, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>It is believed that quantifying the words 'size, scale and location' would ensure that the policy is more transparent. The proposed SPG provides guidance as to the Council's expectations regarding providing information when thresholds are reached. The aim is to prepare an initial draft of the CCA by the time of the EIP hearings.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the policy's criteria to refer to specific thresholds.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF15, NF19, NF21</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p>
279	Mr Aled Evans [2646]	PS1	Object	<p>The Welsh language</p> <p>Restrict large developments in general</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b> – The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p>

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>(9.2.2). Edge Analytics prepared a series of scenarios that looked at migration patterns, economic changes and housing construction. In addition, a number of national and local factors that influence the local housing market were studied. It is believed that the demand for new housing units seen in the Deposit Plan is a positive way of planning in terms of scale development. It gives a figure which is more likely to be realized, reflecting the characteristics of the Plan area and its communities and recognizing demographic, economic changes that can happen and environmental and other constraints on development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

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

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

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>the Council's expectations regarding providing information when thresholds are reached. The aim is to prepare an initial draft of the CCA by the time of the EIP hearings.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the policy's criteria to refer to specific thresholds.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF15, NF16, NF19, NF21</b></p> <p>To ensure clarity and internal consistency of the Plan</p>
955 958	Menter Môn (Helen Thomas) [1615] Hunaniaith (Debbie A. Williams Jones) [3037]	PS1	Object	<p>The Strategic Policy is to be welcomed, but the Plan should be looked at in a more coordinated way to ensure that this policy is implemented to make certain that there are no other elements of the plan, such as the housing numbers policy, that militate against it.</p> <p>Due to the unique nature of the County there is a need for the Welsh language to be an important consideration in the planning system. Believe it is</p>	<p><b>Partially accepted</b> - The Plan strategy seeks to support development of a scale and nature that is appropriate for the location and the settlement. This way of tackling the issue has been assessed against the sustainability framework of the Sustainability Assessment, which has been informed by the Language Impact Assessment.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
				<p>necessary to extend the boundaries to defend the Welsh language and vitality and viability of the Welsh language in the communities of Anglesey and Gwynedd. The Deposit Plan needs to reflect the fact that the Welsh language is a horizontal theme throughout the whole Plan. Clarity is required over how it is intended to protect the Welsh language.</p>	<p>It is believed that quantifying the words 'size, scale and location' would ensure that the policy is more transparent. The proposed SPG provides guidance as to the Council's expectations regarding providing information when thresholds are reached. The aim is to prepare an initial draft of the CCA by the time of the EIP hearings.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to the Plan's policies in promoting an appropriate mix of housing units and to the step by step provision.</p> <p>However, it is believed that there are grounds to make some focussed changes to better highlight how the Plan promotes development, which, jointly with other measures, will be in the interests of the Welsh language. Note also the content of the background documents relevant to the Welsh language.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the Policy criteria to refer to</p>

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

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

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

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

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

## Infrastructure and Developer Contributions

### Introduction

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

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

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

**PS2 – Infrastructure and Developer Contributions**

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

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

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

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

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

#### ISA1 – Infrastructure Provision

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
146	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]	Policy ISA1	Object	There is no definition of what development will be subject to what planning obligations.	<b>Not accepted</b>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
147	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]			Given the specific characteristics of mineral extraction. Minerals development should not be subject to CIL.	<p>The SPG on Planning Obligations will provide more detailed information regarding what types of development will be subject to what planning obligations. Introduction of a CIL regime is a voluntary measure and will only be introduced if there is robust evidence to demonstrate that the local market is viable. The Councils will undertake the required research during 2016 – 2017. In the meantime, and if the market proves to be unviable, the Councils will continue to seek relevant contributions via Section 106 Agreements where they meet the statutory tests set out in the CIL Regulations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
303	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	Policy ISA1	Support	We welcome the inclusion of nature conservation in the list of purposes for which contributions may be sought.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
439	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	Policy ISA1	Object	Careful consideration needs to be given to the adverse impact any requirement for developer contributions may have on the viability of new development such as the Company might propose in accordance with Candidate Site submissions refs: SP552 and SP870 (copies of forms attached). Delete sentence 'Where proposals ... must be funded by the proposal.'	<p><b>Partly Accepted</b></p> <p>Where the deliverability of a development may be compromised by the scale of planning obligations and other costs, a viability assessment may be necessary. This should be informed by the particular circumstances of the site and proposed development in question. Assessing the viability of a particular site requires more detailed analysis than at plan level. It is agreed that this should be clarified in the explanation to the Policy.</p> <p>Further guidance will be included in the SPG on Planning Obligations.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the explanation to the Policy to clarify that viability will be considered at a development management stage for clarity.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF20</b></p>
469	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Policy ISA1	Object	There is no reference to the need to assess the viability of the development to afford the contributions requested and also the need to decide between competing	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Once the infrastructure required to enable a scheme to proceed (such as</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>requirements which can't all be afforded by the development. The difference between required infrastructure such as services and other S106 contributions needs to be made.</p>	<p>access and servicing) has been addressed, the priorities given to the provision of different types of infrastructure and community benefits will vary depending upon a number of factors. Additionally, the priority given to different types of infrastructure will vary according to the scale, type and the specific policies applicable to the development. It is expected however that the requirement for planning obligations will aim to address the key issues of the Plan, with the provision of affordable housing being of paramount importance.</p> <p>Where the deliverability of a development may be compromised by the scale of planning obligations and other costs, a viability assessment may be necessary. This should be informed by the particular circumstances of the site and proposed development in question. Assessing the viability of a particular site requires more detailed analysis than at plan level. It is agreed that this should be clarified in the explanation to the Policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the explanation to the Policy to</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					Add additional bullet point to policy.  <b>Focused Change NF19</b>
697	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	Policy ISA1	Object	<p>This policy seeks to ensure that financial contributions or infrastructure are provided by development proposals where necessary in order to make them acceptable and to allow the development to proceed.</p> <p>However, contributions are sought to a broad range of potential purposes which are not clearly defined, are not related to planning, or are not in the control of an applicant or indeed a council to deliver.</p> <p>The policy fails the CIL regulations and should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>The policy therefore does not comply with Test of Soundness C2 as it does not comply with Planning Policy Wales and CE2.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>It is agreed that 'Regeneration' and 'Other contributions considered appropriate' are non-specific examples and should be omitted from the policy to avoid ambiguity.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Delete 'regeneration' and 'other contribution considered appropriate to the proposal'. Include 'public realm and amend the explanation to explain that the list is not exhaustive or limiting.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF19</b></p>
948	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	Policy ISA1	Object	<p>It is necessary to ensure that Bangor's infrastructure can cope with the additional dwellings. The roads, schools, GPs surgeries, water systems, sewage systems, police services, the hospital, let alone the general amenities are already unsuitable for the</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>The capacity of existing infrastructure to cope with any new development will be considered by the Local Planning Authority as part of the planning</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				population in Bangor without adding more to them. Nothing should be built unless residents have easy access to adequate infrastructure including schools, surgeries, shops and community amenities.	<p>application process subject to Policy ISA and the CIL Regs.</p> <p>Should there be a requirement for additional infrastructure this policy allows the councils to seek such infrastructure as part of the development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1060	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	Policy ISA1	Object	Clarification is required about what infrastructure is required to deliver the allocated sites and how and when this will be delivered within the plan period, and whether any phasing of development will be required. It is not clear whether Policy ISA1 prioritises the infrastructure requirement or whether this is merely a list. The viability work relating to the site deliverability is also weak The authority should also be able to indicate a priority list, in the generality, of what obligations it will seek from development and the financial magnitude of such obligations and the impact of viability. If a CIL is not in place, there could be a policy	<p><b>Accepted in part</b></p> <p>Topic Paper 13 Community Infrastructure sets out the existing and known planned infrastructure in the Plan area. Preparation of this Topic Paper is an iterative one and will be revised as new information is received. The process of assessing Candidate Sites has also provided useful information at a site specific level. Therefore, all of the infrastructure needed to deliver the Plan's Strategy has been assessed. At this stage, it is anticipated that funding will be secured through other mechanisms</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				vacuum in the plan's ability to capture financial receipts to support development.	<p>outside the remit of CIL and therefore the pooling of 5 or more contributions to aid delivery of infrastructure is not anticipated to be an issue. Whilst this is the approach that will be taken at this stage, the Councils will continue to monitor the situation. The Topic Paper about community infrastructure and the work undertaken to justify the allocations in the Plan will form an useful starting point to consider whether there is a requirement for a CIL charging schedule. Any such considerations would be assessed by a study to investigate the viability potential of adopting a CIL charging schedule. Where developments generate a need for improvements to existing or require new infrastructure, such as highway improvements, promotion of active travel, contributions to employment opportunities, education provision, the Welsh language, environmental enhancements or improvements to public realm and open space, these will be required as part of the development and explained in further detail within the proposed Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Guidance.</p>

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

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
	Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]			<p>of terms which appear to relate to the same thing these being 'infrastructure', 'community benefit' and 'community infrastructure contributions'. Use one word to describe S106 contributions to avoid confusion.</p> <p>There is no reference to the need to assess the viability of the scheme to provide the 'community benefits'. Additional wording required or new para to talk about viability assessments in relation to the amount and range of community benefits requested.</p>	<p>It is agreed that there should be more consistency in the terminology used. See response to representation 1125-1127 above.</p> <p>In terms of the comment regarding the need to assess the viability of a scheme, see response to 439</p> <p>The SPG on Planning Obligations will provide more detailed information regarding what obligations the Local Authority will seek from development.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend the wording to improve clarity and consistency with Regulations.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF20</b></p>
1087	Cyfoeth Naturiol Cymru / Natural Resource Wales (Ymgynhoriadau Cynllunio) [1521]	7.1.13	Object	<p>Paragraph 7.1.13 of the Deposit Plan notes that engagement with Dwr Cymru/Welsh Water has been undertaken through Plan preparation process. NRW is aware that there may be capacity issues with Treborth Waste Water Treatment Works that serves Bangor, Y Felinheli, Bethel, and an area of south Anglesey. This may constrain development within these areas, and</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Dŵr Cymru has been consulted during the identification of potential sites for development. As part of the planning application process, the Local Planning Authority will consult with Dŵr Cymru about the capacity of existing infrastructure to cope with development.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				therefore we strongly recommend that Dwr Cymru / Welsh Water's views are sought on this specific issue.	<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

### ISA2 – Community Facilities

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
1417	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	POLICY ISA2	Object	<p>The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <p>* Provision of community facilities that satisfy local need.</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Policy ISA2 aims to protect existing community facilities and encourages the development of new facilities where appropriate.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

### ISA3 – Further and Higher Education Development

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
1129	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY ISA3	Object	<p>Horizon notes that these site selection limitations are potentially too restrictive if applied to its associated development. Rather than seek for specific amendments to policy ISA3 Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which would be the relevant policies against which to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon is not proposing specific exclusion of</p>	<p><b>Not accepted</b></p> <p>Any proposals for nuclear related development including that associated with the proposed Wylfa Newydd, will be assessed against Policy PS9 and numerous policies i the Plan.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				its associated development (i.e. simulator building) from these policies.	No change is required to address the objector's representation.  <b>No change</b>

#### ISA4 – Safeguarding Existing Open Space

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
110	CPERA (Cynghorydd Elin Walker Jones) [2760]	7.1.20	Support	Existing open plots should not be built on or destroyed at all	<b>Note supporting comment</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No change</b>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
122	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	Policy ISA5	Object	Point 1 is unacceptable as a developer cannot be expected to provide open space off site on land he doesn't own. If provision cannot be provided on site then an off site contribution should be taken to improve existing facilities in the area as at point 2.	<b>Not accepted</b>  Point 1 notes that providing off site provision may not be feasible in some circumstances and where this is the case, developers should contribute towards

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>There is no reference to the adoption/management of such spaces.</p> <p>Point 1 should be removed or reworded. Reference needs to be made in the explanatory text with regard to adoption and management of such spaces.</p>	<p>new or improved facilities.</p> <p>An SPG on the provision of open spaces in new housing developments will provide details regarding the adoption/management of such spaces.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
304	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	Policy ISA5	Object	<p>Greater emphasis should be given to the provision of unstructured open space in this policy and paragraph 7.1.23 and others. At a time when young people are better-informed about environmental issues but also increasingly cut off from direct contact with nature, we think that opportunities to discover the outdoors first-hand must be provided. Through links with other policies and strategies the LDP can allow young people to engage more in their own surroundings and with examples of conservation and sustainability in action.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b></p> <p>Policy ISA5 refers specifically to the requirement for housing developments of a certain size to address the need for opportunities for healthy recreation and leisure activities for occupants of new development. It is accepted that the Policy isn't sufficiently clear in terms of facilitating improved accessibility to existing open spaces, formal or informal greenspaces.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend criterion 2 to refer to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>contribution towards the improvement of accessibility to existing open space facilities or existing natural greenspaces. This aligns with Policy PS5, which includes the need to improve the understanding and appreciation of the natural environment in terms of its social contribution.</p> <p><b>Focused change NF22</b></p>
1130	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	Policy ISA5	Object	<p>Horizon notes that these criteria in this policy are not appropriate for its temporary construction worker accommodation. For example it would be an inappropriate standard for typical occupiers e.g. construction workers, students in temporary single person accommodation, to require children's play space.</p> <p>Rather than seek for specific amendments to ISA5 to exclude application of this policy from the worker accommodation, Horizon proposes to rely on the Wylfa Newydd specific policies proposed below which would be the relevant policies against which to determine associated development applications. For this reason Horizon isn't proposing specific exclusion of its associated development from this policy.</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b></p> <p>Any proposals for development associated with the proposed Wylfa Newydd, will be assessed against Policy PS9 and a number of other policies in the Plan including Policy TAI3.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

## Information and Communications Technology

### PS3 – Information and Communications Technology

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
533	Mobile Operators Association (Mr John Cooke) [1638]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS3	Support	We support the inclusion of Strategic Policy PS3 which we consider to be in accordance with national policy and guidance.	<p><b>Note supporting comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>
1415	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS3	Support	<p>The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Allowing technology development to facilitate employment development in rural areas;</li> <li>* Support working from home and measures that would improve broadband and communication particularly in the remote areas.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Note supporting comment.</b></p> <p>Policy PS3 facilitates accessibility to rural areas through information technology.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No change</b></p>

## Sustainable Transport, Development and Accessibility

### PS4 – Sustainable Transport, Development and Accessibility

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
664	Noel Davey, Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	We support the transport hierarchy in PS4 and para 7.1.28 which gives priority to access by walking and cycling, so as to minimise the need to travel by private car. PS4 #3 aims to "Improve and enhance the public footpath and cycleway network to improve safety, accessibility by these modes of travel". We would add "and to increase health, leisure, well-being and tourism benefits for both local residents and visitors". The strategy appears to have mainly access for new development projects in mind, but should also address wider RoW network issues.	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>It is felt that the additional wording would add value to the policy through highlighting the benefits from walking and cycling.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Include the proposed amendment in the revised version of Strategic Policy PS4.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF23</b> <b>Minor Change NB3</b></p>
1131	Horizon	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	Horizon welcomes the policy requirement that development will be located so as to minimise the need to travel. This supports Horizon's stage one pre-application consultation which has based site selection for accommodation on (among other factors) its proximity to the Wylfa site. Provision of on-site facilities and services further supports this approach, with connection to other existing	<p><b>Accepted in part</b> – Agree with the representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly. However amending the policy with a reference to specific tests within the CIL Regulations would add unnecessary detail to the policy. This matter is addressed within the introduction to policy PS2 Infrastructure and Developer Contributions.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				settlements forming a secondary consideration. Horizon's amendment seeks to remove linking rail upgrades with its project to the policy specifically on rail infrastructure. Horizon has clarified that infrastructure improvements required must be required in accordance with the CIL Regulations.	<p><b>Recommendation</b> – Amend wording in relation to rail-related improvements and reference to Section 106 obligations.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF23</b></p>
148	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	<p>With a preferred area of search for sand and gravel identified at Bodychain, Llanllyfni under Policy MWYN3, should this area prove commercially viable and planning permission be granted the existing plant site could be utilised at Cefn Graianog with a connection under the existing footpath/cyclepath being required. As such some might consider this would not enhance the footpath/cyclepath.</p> <p>At point 3 start with quote: “Where possible improve and enhance...”</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.</p> <p>It is felt that the additional wording adds flexibility to Strategic Policy PS4.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Include the additional wording at the start of Point 3 in Strategic Policy PS4.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF23</b></p>
448	Bourne Leisure Ltd	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	<p>Bourne Leisure considers that the following sentence should be added to PS4:</p> <p>“in rural areas, the Council acknowledges that there is little alternative but to travel by private car.”</p>	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.</p> <p>Planning Policy Wales (PPW) promotes sustainable development. Paragraph 4.7.7 in PPW states that the majority of new development should be located in those</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>settlements which have relatively good accessibility by non-car modes. The Plan's spatial strategy is based upon the principle of paragraph 4.7.7 in PPW.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
527	Bangor Civic Society	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Support	PS4 – Sustainable Transport	<p><b>Note Supporting Comment</b></p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
617	Mr Mark Roberts, Barton Willmore, Cardiff	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	Support the overall aims and objectives of this policy, however the statement "development will be located so as to minimise the need to travel" does not reflect PPW. PPW only refers to "minimising the need to travel, and increasing accessibility by modes other than the private car (paragraph 4.7.4) and not minimising the need to travel in isolation. The policy is therefore overly rigid, not positively prepared and does not recognise the ability of bus, cycle and pedestrian links to offer sustainable, convenient access to various services.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any change.</p> <p>It is felt that the policy reflects the aspirations of Planning Policy Wales in terms of minimising the need to travel whilst seeking transport improvements that increase accessibility for all modes of transport.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
1280	Bourne Leisure	Strategic Policy PS4 Sustainable Transport	Object	Emerging transport policies should recognise that due to the location of many tourist facilities and attractions, there is often no other feasible option available other than the private car to reach certain tourist development. Bourne Leisure is disappointed that PS4 fails to recognise that some tourism sites are located in rural areas where no public transport exists. PS4 as currently drafted is unsound as it is not in accordance with national policy. TAN18: Transport (March 2007) specifically acknowledges that some tourist developments rely on car-based travel and advises: "...in rural areas a lack of public transport access needs to be balanced against the contribution tourism makes to the rural economy in the specific area..." (para 3.15) Bourne Leisure considers that the following sentence should be added to PS4: "in rural areas, the Council acknowledges that there is little alternative but to travel by private car."	<b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any change.  This statement could be interpreted as promoting the use of private cars. This is contrary to the aspirations of Planning Policy Wales in terms of transport use. In line with paragraph 3.11 of TAN 18 which refers to embodying sustainability principles, the Plan seeks to ensure that most development should be located in places accessible by a range of travel modes.  <b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

## TRA1 – Transport Network Developments

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1091	Natural Resources Wales	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	The Plan outlines 4 transport schemes that will be secured during the Plan period including the A487 Caernarfon to Bontnewydd bypass, the Llangefni Link Road, a new Menai Strait Crossing and road improvements on the A5025 from Valley to Wylfa Newydd. NRW would appreciate being involved in the discussions regarding these proposed schemes as early as possible in order to identify key development constraints and provide advice. For some of the above named schemes NRW has already provided Scoping advice.	<p><b>Do not Accept</b> As part of the Planning Process statutory consultees such as NRW will be consulted. Including reference within the policy would add unnecessary detail to the policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1132	Horizon Nuclear Power	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	<p>There is a typographical error in 2. (ii) and (iii) where in each case "facilitates" should be amended to read "facilities". (Not shown in the specific amendments sought.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend 3(i) for clarity including bring the table into the policy so it is clear what development is affected.</li> <li>• New 3(ii) then arises from the second limb of the existing text (after the table).</li> <li>• Amend 4(iii) to ensure there is no suggestion that the Plan is pre-</li> </ul>	<p><b>Accepted in Part</b> – The spelling errors will be corrected.</p> <p>Agree that section 3 of the policy would benefit from minor re-drafting to improve clarity. However it is felt to be more appropriate to retain the table in paragraph 7.1.31.</p> <p>The list in part 4 of policy TRA 1 are identified transport schemes that the Plan seeks to protect through showing them on the proposals map. In light of the comment regarding ongoing environmental impact assessment regarding</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				empting the environmental impact assessments which Horizon is undertaking and from which the need for transport infrastructure upgrades should derive from.	<p>the need for transport infrastructure upgrades which Horizon is currently undertaking reference to these improvements, together with the areas shown on the proposals map, should be removed from policy TRA 1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Amend section 3 and 4 (iii) to improve clarity.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF24</b></p>
1133 & 1134	Horizon Nuclear Power	Paragraphs 7.1.30 to 7.1.44	Object	<p>Related to the representations on TRA1, new wording to replace existing paragraph 7.1.41 has been provided to avoid pre-emption and to refer to the development of Horizon's Integrated Traffic and Transport Strategy ("ITTS"). Horizon supports the inclusion of a suitably worded statement in support of it working in partnership with the Councils to develop an agreed ITTS for the Project, to be supported through policy TRA1.</p>	<p><b>Accepted</b> – Agree to the re-wording of the title above paragraph 7.1.41 and paragraph 7.1.44 to highlight where the need for transport infrastructure upgrades has been demonstrated.</p> <p>Travel Plans are already referenced in paragraphs 7.1.30 and 7.1.32, however previous response has agreed to include reference within policy TRA 1 to travel plans..</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – Amend title to paragraph 7.1.41 and paragraph 7.1.44.</p> <p><b>Focussed Change NF25</b> <b>Minor Change NB2</b></p>
1185, 1186,	Welsh Water	Policy TRA1 Transport	Object	There are a number of locations where the proposed route passes over DCWW	<b>Do not Accept</b> As part of the Planning Process statutory consultees such as Dwr Cymru Welsh

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1187		Network Developments		assets (public sewers and water mains). Under the Water Industry Act 1991 Dwr Cymru Welsh Water has rights to access its apparatus at all times. Protection measures in respect of these assets will be required either in the form of an easement width or a possible diversion of the asset.	Water will be consulted. Including reference within the policy would add unnecessary detail to the policy.  <b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
525,	Bangor Civic Society	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	TRA1: Transport Networks 4) 'Transport Schemes' - there is a complete absence of any rail proposals.	<b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any change.  Safeguarding existing rail lines is included in TRA3.  <b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
876	Mr John Tripp, Porthaethwy	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	* too much emphasis on cars; *cycleways to be implemented (not positive enough); * rail and bus. Electric rail - as part of extension of the HS3 Holyhead to Hull.	<b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.  It is felt that Policy TRA1 conforms to the aspirations of Planning Policy Wales in terms of transport use.

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
1055	Mr Mark Newey, Llywdoraeth Cymru	Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments	Object	The potential loss of BMV land could result in the permanent loss of approximately 40 hectares. The majority of the land is included in allocations TRA1, C14 and C15 and the plan has limited evidence to demonstrate that paragraph 4.10 has been considered at all in allocating these sites for development.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – The land identified in policy TRA 1 are highway improvement schemes that have been identified as routes requiring protection within the plan.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Llangefni link road does cross over high quality agricultural land in the vicinity of Llangefni however this proposal has the benefit of a planning permission under 34LPA1013/FR/EIA/CC. Therefore the loss of high quality agricultural land has been assessed as part of the application.</p> <p>All relevant bodies would be consulted on all the developments highlighted in Policy TRA1, and the permanent loss of high quality agricultural land would be addressed at the application stage.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> – No change to Policy TRA1.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
683	Barton Willmore	7.1.31	Object	Paragraph 7.1.31 and 7.1.32 provides extensive commentary on the need and requirements for Transport Assessments, but duplicates PPW. This is unnecessary.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.</p> <p>Paragraphs 7.1.31 and 7.1.32 provide context to Policy TRA1.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
530	Bangor Civic Society	7.1.37	Object	Tern E22 – Clarification is needed of whether Britannia Bridge and parts of North Wales are still on E22.	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any change.</p> <p>It is felt that paragraph 7.1.37 does explain that the A55 is on the E22.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p><b>No Change</b></p>
877	Mr John Tripp	7.1.37	Object	Menai Straits Crossing – why not submerge tunnel from Griffiths Crossing. Has thought been given to: *reversible 2 lane crossing on A55	<p><b>Not Accepted</b> – Do not agree with representation and do not recommend any changes.</p>

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				*the rail deck beneath the A55 is only 50% used.	Options on a third crossing of the Menai Strait are being considered by the Welsh Government but to date no formal decision has been made.  <b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>
512	Gwynedd Archaeological Trust Planning Service	7.1.42 (Policy TRA1 Transport Network Developments)	Support	Formal consultation on these improvements will be required since some of these areas have the potential to impact upon the archaeological resource.	<b>Do not Accept</b> As part of the Planning process consultees such as the Gwynedd Archaeological Trust will be consulted. Including reference within the policy would add unnecessary detail to the policy.  <b>Recommendation</b> No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.  <b>No Change</b>

#### TRA2 – Parking Standards

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1096	Mr Mark Newey, Llywdoraeth	Policy TRA2 Parking Standards	Object	It should be noted that Planning Policy Wales sets out that local authorities should ensure that new developments	<b>Accepted</b> – We agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly.

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	Cymru	(paragraph 7.1.45)		provide lower levels of parking than have generally been achieved in the past. Technical Advice Note 18 states that maximum car parking standards should be used as a form of demand management.	<p>Reference will be given to Planning Policy Wales and TAN 18 in explanation paragraphs 7.1.45 and 7.1.46.</p> <p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>Make changes to paragraph 7.1.45 based upon the submitted comments.</p> <p><b>Focused Change NF26</b></p>

### TRA3 – Safeguarding Disused Railway Lines

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

Comment Number	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Comments / Changes to the Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				alternative transport purposes will be promoted and encouraged."	Make changes to Policy TRA3 based upon the submitted comments.  <b>Focussed Change NF27</b>
440	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog	Policy TRA3 Disused Railway Lines	Support	We hope that Gwynedd Council can help to solve this matter.	<b>Note supporting Comments</b>  <b>Recommendation</b>  <b>No Change</b>

#### TRA4 – Managing Transport Impacts

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

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

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