

APPENDIX A – CHAPTER 7.2 SUSTAINABLE LIVING

Sustainable Development and Climate Change

Context and Introduction

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				but only a requirement to refer to the broad sustainable development policies.	
1056	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.2.4	Object	<p>A Renewable Energy Assessment has been undertaken for both areas, however the Deposit Plan fails to take the opportunity to take into account the contribution the area can make towards developing and facilitating renewable and low carbon energy and plan positively for appropriate development. Further consideration needs to be given to how to translate the evidence base into a set of policies which guide appropriate development. For example, could the assessment work provide evidence to provide opportunities for higher sustainable building standards on strategic sites or can the co-location of developments optimise opportunities for renewable energy?</p>	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>The updated toolkit for Planners in relation to Planning for Renewable and Low Carbon Energy (Sept 2015) has an additional section to assess the potential for solar farm developments. In addition a letter dated the 10 December 2015 by the Minister for Natural Resources expects the allocation of areas of search for local-authority scale (5MW to 25MW) renewable energy schemes or other low carbon technologies.</p> <p>In light of this the Councils have commissioned additional work to ascertain any potential areas for solar farm developments. In addition an assessment against the areas Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity study will ascertain whether any local-authority scale areas of search should be identified in the Plan.</p> <p>The introduction to policy PS7 has been amended to reflect this on-going work.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>The Deposit plan did not identify strategic sites.</p> <p>Agree that an additional criterion could be included within policy PS5 in relation to promoting co-location of development to optimise opportunities for renewable energy.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Include an additional criterion within policy PS5 in relation to co-location of development.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF28</p>

PS5 – Sustainable Development

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

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>especially #6 'preserve and 'enhance' the quality of .. assets' and #7 protect and 'improve' the quality of the natural environment. There is probably a need to add some qualifier e.g. 'wherever possible'. It is noted that the introduction of objectives #10-14 does include the words 'proposals should also where appropriate:'</p>	<p>separately and assessed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>It is felt that adding a qualifier as suggested would devalue the requirement for proposals to adopt the principles of sustainable development in other types of development.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No change</p>
767	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	<p>PS5 #4 'Promote greater self---containment of Centres and Villages by contributing to balanced communities that are supported by sufficient services; cultural, arts, sporting and entertainment activities; a varied range of employment opportunities; physical and social infrastructure; and a choice of modes of travel;' This approach will clash with pressure for 'economies of scale' e.g. the current arguments about concentration of services in N Wales NHS.</p>	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>Promoting the self-containment of settlements is important to ensure communities are balanced and in turn, promote sustainable development in the Plan area, which is advocated in national planning policy.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					No change
768	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	Criterion 13 Improve sense by inserting 'car' and deleting 'means of' : 'Reduce the need to travel by car and encourage the opportunities for all users to travel when required as often as possible by means of alternative modes'.	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>The suggested amendment will add clarity to the policy. However, 'private transport' should be inserted instead of 'car'.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Include reference to private transport in the policy.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF28</p>
852	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	This is a 14-part policy, requiring compliance with a plethora of issues. It does not embody a presumption in favour of sustainable development set out in PPW. It does not allow the balancing of the benefits of development to the social, economic and indeed environmental (remediation and redevelopment of previously developed and contaminated site for example) themes with any adverse impacts. It is a largely negatively worded policy. PPW provides a clear presumption in favour of sustainable development. It does not embody any	<p>Accepted</p> <p>It is agreed that the wording of the policy would benefit from minor editorial changes to demonstrate that the Plan will be positively seeking sustainable development. Detailed application of these principles is set out in other sections of the Plan. The criteria in the Policy signpost the reader to where in the Plan the policies may be found.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				regardless of any reference/s to Strategic Policy PS18.	<p>Policy PS18 specifically relates to the need to ensure the sustainable use of minerals. It is considered that this policy is sufficient in this respect.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No change</p>
1135	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS5	Object	Horizon considers that it would be beneficial to remove some of the repetition, circularity and potential inconsistencies arising from references to other policies. For example, criteria 5, 6, 16, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 simply cross refer to other policies which will apply to and control these matters.	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>The strategic policies provide the context for the detailed policies in the Plan. Removing the criteria as suggested would devalue and weaken the policy in terms of ensuring that proposals adopt the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No change</p>

PS6 – Alleviating and Adapting to the Effects of Climate Change

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
170	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			Suggest a hierarchy for assessing effects of development proposals and notwithstanding other policies in the development plan. At point 6 start "Where possible ..." At point 10 start "Where possible ..."	national planning policy a core function of the Plan is to ensure that all development in the Plan area is sustainable, taking full account of the implications of reducing resource use and addressing climate change. This Policy is part of a framework for sustainable growth by promoting development that mitigates the causes of climate change and which is able to adapt to its likely effects. Recommendation No change is required to address the objector's representation. No change
398	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths) [2680]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Support	DCWW support the inclusion of this policy and the requirement placed upon developers to aim for the highest possible standard in terms of water efficiency and the use of sustainable drainage systems. The tackling of surface water at source is a vital component of sustainable development and will go a long way to mitigate against overloading sewers which can ultimately lead to flooding. The Floods and Water Management Act 2010 reinforces the obligations for developers to incorporate	Note supporting comment Recommendation No change

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>can be justified in that location and that the consequences associated with flooding are acceptable.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No change</p>
661	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Support	<p>We agree that tackling climate change and reducing carbon emissions is a key objective. We support the 'energy hierarchy' concept proposed in PS6 where ranked priority is given to 1) reducing need 2) efficient use and supply, before 3) using renewable energy. We also agree that renewable energy should be used wherever 'practical and viable' and should be 'consistent with the need to engage and involve local communities, protect visual amenities, the natural, built and historic environment and the landscape'.</p>	<p>Note supporting comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>
769	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Support	<p>The proposed energy hierarchy is fully supported.</p>	<p>Note supporting comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
846	Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners (Mr Arwel Evans) [2767]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Object	Bourne Leisure supports sustainable development in its buildings, venues and accommodation units. All new buildings, refurbishments of existing venues and the company's hire fleet holiday homes incorporate a number of features designed to achieve sustainable development. It is considered that sustainable design and construction should be primarily sought via Building Regulations. It is proposed that the Plan should make it clear that the initial design of a building will need to consider the ability to meet Building Regulations' requirements in the future. Based on the fact that TAN22 was cancelled it is unnecessary for the Plan to make reference to energy efficiency features and measures.	<p>Not Accepted</p> <p>Paragraphs 4.11.5 and 9.1.2 of PPW promote energy efficiency with new development.</p> <p>The wording within PS6 is an expectation that developers have 'fully taken account' of factors that alleviate and adapt development to the effects of Climate change.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan and ensuring the Plan's soundness.</p> <p>No Change</p>
859	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Support	Policy PS6 is supported	<p>Note supporting comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>
1057	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS6	Object	The renewable energy assessment could be used to improve the policy wording for PS6 and PCYFF4, as these stand they lack clarity.	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>Including information regarding the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				The energy assessment could make it clear what is expected and to what scale/ type of development the policies apply.	<p>renewable energy assessment in Policy PS6 would add unnecessary detail to the Strategic Policy. However, it is agreed that additional information should be included in Policy PCYFF4. See response to representation no. 1058.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Additional information included in policy PCYFF4.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF32</p>

PCYFF1 – Development Criteria

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					Focused Change NF29
1136	Horizon Nuclear Power (Miss Sarah Fox) [2919]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	Residual concerns that criterion 3 is more restrictive in terms development siting than other sections of the Plan. It is also noted that Policy PS15 relates exclusively to housing whereas the wording of PCYFF1 implies that it relates to all forms of development, which risks creating confusion. · Criterion 4 is considered inconsistent with the drafting of the other criteria. · Criteria 9 and 10 requirements are dealt with elsewhere in the Plan and could be deleted here. · Criterion 14 is not sufficiently clear.	Accepted in part It is agreed that a degree of discretion should be reflected in the policy. It is acknowledged that the suggested amendments would add clarity and accuracy to the Plan. Recommendation Apply a degree of discretion to bullet points 1 and 2; and amend bullet 14. Focused Change NF29
774	Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Roberts) [1645]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	This policy provides a 14 part multi criteria policy, and the first and second requirements are that "A proposal must comply with all relevant policies of the Plan", and "must comply with national planning policy and guidance." This is considered to be an impossible task, because the Policy does not: * embody the presumption in favour of sustainable development and is not positively prepared.	Accepted It is agreed that a degree of discretion should be reflected in the policy. Recommendation See response to representation 1136 above. Focused Change NF29

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				<p>* allow for any application of the key requirement of planning, which is the balance of often competing and conflicting objectives, thus considering, what policies are of key relevance, what weight should be given to competing objectives and how does a proposal comply with the "presumption in favour of sustainable development of the Welsh Government", and</p> <p>* it replicates other policies in the Plan e.g. landscape, highways, design etc.</p> <p>The Policy needs to be rewritten in a positively prepared manner with a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p>	
124	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	<p>Should not use the word 'must' as this does not allow the flexibility for other material planning considerations to form part of the determination process. This ability to consider other material planning considerations is a fundamental part of national planning legislation.</p> <p>Change the word 'must' to 'should' on all the points where it is used.</p>	<p>Accepted</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the plan should show a degree of flexibility and demonstrate some discretion in certain circumstances.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Amend policy wording as suggested to ensure accuracy. See response to representation 1136 above.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF29</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
171	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	General policy likely to be aimed at urban development but does not specify. There is no recognition of the particular circumstances of mineral working and the locational need for minerals to be worked where they are found. Suggest a hierarchy for assessing environmental effects of development proposals as not all environmental assets are of the same value. If applied too rigidly to mineral extraction sites then there is a risk of unnecessary sterilisation.	<p>Accepted in part</p> <p>Agree that there can be circumstances where specific locational requirement could be justified for the location of a specific development.</p> <p>To allow for consideration of such circumstances criterion 3 within policy PCYFF1 should be amended through the inclusion of reference to specific locational requirement for a proposal.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Amend criterion 3 within policy PCYFF1.</p> <p>Focused Change NF29</p>
172	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			The policy should 'endeavour' to achieve the aims of the policy. Exceptionally some developments such as minerals will not be able to comply with the aspirations of the policy but those schemes should nevertheless still be permissible. Suggest start the policy with "Where relevant all proposals should endeavour ..." then delete points 1, 2 and 8 as they are unwieldy and unnecessary.	
307	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	Greater emphasis should be given to the protection of the natural environment in this policy to reflect the importance of this issue throughout the LDP. Add point 15 "natural environment".	<p>Not Accepted</p> <p>The Policy's explanation states that the purpose of the policy is to raise issues that are not covered elsewhere in the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					Plan. The natural environment (like the built environment) is given attention in other parts of the Plan. Recommendation No change
399	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths) [2680]	POLICY PCYFF1	Support	DCWW support the provision within this policy that planning permission will be refused where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact upon the health, safety or amenity of occupiers of local residences, other land and property uses or characteristics of the locality due to drainage pollution.	Note supporting comment Recommendation No change
437	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	POLICY PCYFF1	Support	Support.	Note supporting comment Recommendation No change
772	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	Criterion 4 Housing density. While agreeing that dense settlement can be efficient in terms of land use etc. the impression on the landscape of dense estates of detached houses is alien to the traditional landscape in North Wales where settlement has not been significantly concentrated, except in	Not accepted Other policies in the Plan will ensure that any development proposals that could potentially have a detrimental impact upon the landscape will be refused.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				19th century quarrying areas. (See PCYFF2) If density is to be encouraged it should be through the building of terraces, rather than little boxes. The terrace or even semi-detached units produce much better proportioned building blocks. The social (and economic) value of gardens should not be forgotten.	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No change</p>
881	Mr John Tripp [252]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	The uplands - a lot are overgrazed. Would like to see more 'regreening' to stop the immediate run off and flooding. Also, CO2 collect with trees.	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>Amending as suggested would add unnecessary detail to the policy. However it is agreed that regard should be made to the natural environment. See response to representation 307.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No Change</p>
1015	Ministry of Defence (MOD Safeguarding) [1275]	POLICY PCYFF1	Object	The MODs principle concern with respect to development in Anglesey and Gwynedd is ensuring that structures, particularly tall buildings do not cause an obstruction to air traffic movements at MOD aerodromes or compromise the operation of air	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>As part of the planning application process, Anglesey County Council will consult the MOD when a particular proposal could potentially affect activities</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				navigational transmitter/ receiver facilities located in the area. The MOD height and technical safeguarding zones for the main operational base of RAF Valley and Mona extends over the area of Anglesey. The borough is also covered by the statutory birdstrike safeguarding zone encompassing RAF Valley and Mona. Therefore if/when development is progressed the MOD DIO should be consulted to ensure an accurate and effective assessment is carried out. Gwynedd does not fall within any statutory safeguarding consultation zones.	for which it is responsible. Including reference to the need to consult the MOD within the policy would add unnecessary detail to the Plan. Recommendation No change is required to address the objector's representation. No Change

PCYFF2 – Design and Place Shaping

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
173	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	General policy likely to be aimed at urban development but does not specify e.g. (not all landscape is of the same value). If considered to apply to mineral extraction sites suggest changes set out below.	Not accepted Developments associated with mineral extraction would be considered under other policies set out in the plan namely, Policies PS19, MWYN1-10. The policy does state that all the criteria need to be conformed to, but only where this is relevant.
174	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			Each proposal should be dealt with on its merits however this policy if applied to mineral extraction sites it would prove very	

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				difficult to comply with. Suggest start the policy with "Where relevant ..."; then amend points two to start "Where possible".	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No Change</p>
400	Dwr Cymru Welsh Water (Mr Dewi Griffiths) [2680]	POLICY PCYFF2	Support	DCWW support the requirement that drainage systems are designed to limit surface water run-off and flood risk and prevent pollution.	<p>Note supporting comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>
436	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	POLICY PCYFF2	Support	Support.	<p>Note supporting comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>
775	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	Criterion 1 How practical is it to prove it 'enhances' as well as complements? When will it be judged 'relevant'.	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>It is considered that proposals can complement as well as enhance the character of a site.</p> <p>Whilst design and place shaping go beyond traditional aesthetic considerations and should be the aim for all development proposals, the Policy</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
	[1169]				<p>reasonable development of other adjacent land because of the layout and form of the development is not in accordance with the principles of sustainable development.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Re-word the bullet point</p> <p>Focused Change NF30</p>
943	Cydbwyllgor Ymgynghorol AHNE (Cyngorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	I believe there should be specific reference to standard design that corresponds to the context of the AONB.	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>The special landscape features of AONBs in the Plan Area are protected via Strategic Policy PS16 and national policies and legislation as outlined in table 23. Nonetheless it is considered that Policy CYFF3 would benefit from reference to reference to “or other detailed assessments adopted by the Local Planning Authority” to reflect the publication of an assessment of features that may be specific to the AONBs, which would be a material planning consideration.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to Policy PCYFF2. Amend Policy PCYFF 3 as referred to above.</p> <p>Focussed change NF31</p>
1425	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	POLICY PCYFF2	Object	<p>The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * New agricultural buildings that are suitable for contemporary farming having considered their scale, location, design and materials to reduce their visual impact on the landscape; * Where possible new buildings should be grouped with any existing buildings in order to reduce their visual impact on the landscape. However, isolated buildings should be permitted if their location is essential to the agricultural activity if they aren't located in a prominent location. 	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>It is considered that the issues raised by the objector are covered in other policies within the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No change</p>
779	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	7.2.9	Support	<p>We agree that proximity of poor development should not justify poor quality new development.</p>	<p>Note supporting comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
780	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	7.2.10	Object	This implies some proposals will not require a Design and Access Statement - clarify which ones and what is required instead.	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>Including information regarding in what circumstances a Design and Access is required would add unnecessary detail to the Policy.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector's representation.</p> <p>No change</p>

PCYFF3 – Design and Landscaping

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				to start polic; “Where possible and in accordance with other policies set out in this plan ...”	<p>where landscaping is not possible a site restoration programme will be given weight in relation to any short term visual impact from the development.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector’s representation.</p> <p>No change</p>
781	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF3	Object	We agree with the aims, but have concern about the ability to monitor and enforce landscaping plans and conditions in practice.	<p>Note comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change is required to address the objector’s representation.</p> <p>No change</p>
773	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY PCYFF3	Object	Criterion 1 - We have been unable to locate online detailed Seascape Character Area Assessments	<p>Not accepted</p> <p>The information relating to Seascape Character Area Assessments are available within the Council.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>

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

PCYFF4 – Carbon Management

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
				test C2 and coherence and effectiveness test CE2.	
438	Cyngor Tref Ffestiniog (Mrs Ann Coxon) [2940]	POLICY PCYFF4	Support	Ffestiniog Town Council supports this important policy to control carbon. Exciting plans to build housing and facilities that address the needs of the future should be supported.	Note supporting comment Recommendation No change
453	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY PCYFF4	Object	Bourne Leisure comments however that sustainable design and construction should be primarily sought via Building Regulations. However, the Company also notes that the initial design of a building in the planning process will need to consider the ability to meet Building Regulations' requirements in the future. This point of principle should be set out in the LDP, to ensure that no confusion arises. It is therefore unnecessary for the LDP to make reference to energy efficiency features and measures.	Not Accepted Whilst the Building Regulations play a major role in ensuring that new developments are sustainable in design and construction, the planning system still has a role to play in delivering sustainable development. Recommendation No Change
1058	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY PCYFF4	Object	The renewable energy assessment could be used to improve the policy wording for PS6 and PCYFF4, as these stand they lack clarity. The energy assessment could make it clear what is expected and to what scale/ type of development the policies apply.	Accepted We agree with representation and that the text needs to be amended accordingly. The additional wording provides added value to the policy.

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers comments and recommendations
					No change is required to the policy. No Change

PCYFF5 – Water Conservation

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

Renewable Energy Technology

PS7 – Renewable Energy Technology

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
1080	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.2.23	Object	It refers to the Welsh Government's Energy Policy Statement (2010). This has been superseded by Energy Wales: A Low Carbon Transition (2012).	<p>Accept – agree to change the reference to the appropriate new document to ensure the accuracy of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Change paragraph 7.2.23 to refer to the Energy Wales 2012 document.</p> <p>Minor Change NB4</p>
180, 181	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686], Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited	POLICY PS7	Object	Consider this policy is repetitive of national policy e.g. (not all landscapes are of the same value). The policy is too restrictive and not positive toward renewable energy technologies on existing mineral extractions sites or toward previously used land.	<p>Not accepted – there are very special environmental assets in the area, which have been recognised and designated on a national and international level. Therefore, the area attracts a vast number of tourists / visitors, who make an important contribution to the local economy.</p> <p>Whilst Renewable Energy policies promote renewable technology or low carbon initiatives, it's important that such developments don't compromise the area's biodiversity or landscape designation objectives.</p> <p>Policy ADN1 'On-shore Wind Energy' refers to medium-scale wind farms/turbines (5MW to 25MW)</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[2735]				<p>on urban brownfield/industrial sites which could include mineral excavation sites. For any other type of renewable energy, policy ADN2 may support large-scale proposals in exceptional circumstances, where an overriding need for the scheme can be justified.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
607	Mr Paul Madden [3032]	POLICY PS7	Object	<p>No mention is made of protecting tourist / visitor amenity. Tourism is the most important industry on Anglesey and as such should be protected.</p> <p>Amend criteria (i) and (iii) through adding 'tourism' to the reference towards 'residential amenity'.</p> <p>Criteria (ii) to be amended to read "ii. that installations in areas covered by international, national or local nature conservation designations in accordance with PS16 do not individually or cumulatively compromise the</p>	<p>Accept in part - no robust evidence has been published which shows significant impact on tourism in an area due to the effect of wind turbines. A publication is available on the Welsh Government's website which refers to 'The Economic Impact of Wind Farms on Tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that there was limited evidence that wind farms impacted tourism in Wales.</p> <p>An assessment of any application for a turbine would assess its impact on any building in the vicinity, whether residential or tourism. The employment evidence base in the Plan outlines the importance of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				objectives of the designations".	<p>the tourism industry within the Plan area, and that the industry has a number of different facilities across the countryside in the Plan area. In light of this, and in order to ensure consistency with Strategic Policy PS11 (The Visitor Economy) it is recommended that clause (i) and (iii) are changed to read housing or residential amenity used by visitors.</p> <p>It is believed that the wording of criterion (ii) as it stands, is appropriate, and the objector's suggestion is not accepted.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That clause (i) and (iii) are amended to include reference to housing amenity used by visitors.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF34</p>
662	Campaign for the Protection of Rural	POLICY PS7	Support	We also support the principles laid out in PS7 which describe that renewable energy installations should not individually or cumulatively compromise the objectives of	<p>Note the supporting comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]			designated protected landscape areas, including areas 'visible beyond their boundaries', and 'especially with regard to landscape character, biodiversity or residential amenity.'	
765	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	STRATEGIC POLICY PS7	Object	<p>PS3 states in the context of information and communications technology infrastructure that 'to lessen the visual impact of new overhead lines associated with developments, especially in sensitive locations, they should be placed underground.' This should also apply to electricity transmission cables, particularly in relation to new renewable energy developments, where limitation of visual impact on the landscape is particularly important. Moreover, the possible cumulative loading implications of new projects for capacity of the existing transmission lines should be clearly established to avoid unforeseen needs for later upgrading of overhead lines with a resulting risk of adverse visual impact. It is not enough to leave these matters in the hands of the District Network Operator.</p>	<p>Accept – as the objector notes, a clause has been included in policy PS3 to promote placing new lines underground to lessen their visual impact. No objections were received to this during the public consultation on the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>Whilst there are circumstances where planning permission is not required in order to install lines, it is believed that introducing this principle within policy PS7 provides an opportunity to the Councils to request this in order to lessen the visual impact of new infrastructure serving renewable energy developments, subject to other recognised considerations and the plan's viability.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Add a clause to policy PS7 to refer to installing new lines underground.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					Focussed Change NF34
1420	NFU Cymru (Dafydd Jarrett) [3285]	POLICY PS7	Object	The NFU would like to make the following general comments about the Development Management Policies included in the draft Plan. Opportunities that would not prevent the following development: * provision of renewable energy which is appropriate in terms of its scale and design to its location.	Not accepted – it is believed that the current policy supports renewable energy developments that are appropriate to their settings in terms of size and design. Recommendation Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan. No Change

ADN1 – On-Shore Wind Energy

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
71	Nefyn Town Council (Liz Saville Roberts) [2710]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Nefyn Town Council is firm in its opinion that it is necessary to adhere to policy C26 involving the size of wind turbines in the Llyn AONB, and that an increase in the size of wind turbines should not	Not Accepted – The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan’s area. It concluded that proposals for domestic scale

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				be permitted.	<p>development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
74	Mr David Coucill [2629]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Wind turbines of 50m to tip height cannot be classified as small. This is especially true in the relatively flat landscape of Anglesey where a 50m structure, the height of ~8-storey building, can be seen from miles around.</p> <p>After a consultation, in which almost 10% of the population of Anglesey participated, Anglesey County Council adopted a minimum separation between turbines and domestic properties of 20 times tip height. This has been completely ignored.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>The effect of wind turbine noise on neighbouring properties is ignored in Gillespie's report even though it is recognised as a problem in other areas, e.g. Devon,</p> <p>The SPG on wind turbines approved by Anglesey Council after extensive consultation should not be ignored and should be incorporated into the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to justify the inclusion of separation distances between turbines and houses; therefore, no change to the policy is recommended for this.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
75	Mrs Carolyn Williams [2721]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>I am objecting to Policy ADN1. most of Gwynedd is protected from developments by being a National Park (Snowdonia) or SLA (Lleyn Peninsular). Only Anglesey is open to wide-spread abuse.</p> <p>8000 islanders, who signed a petition in 2012, calling for a 1.5 km separation distance between homes and industrial commercial turbines and the Supplementary Planning Guidance is thrown out.</p> <p>I reject the wind energy policy as presented in this flawed, undemocratic and unsustainable Plan.</p> <p>The 1.5 km separation distance and the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Onshore Wind Energy should be retained.</p> <p>No more 50 metre (large) wind turbines. We are swamped.</p>	<p>Not accepted – All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey’s existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan’s Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Anglesey's Councillors should listen and support their local communities, who don't want 50 metre plus wind turbines blighting the landscapes of Anglesey, and so must reject this draft wind energy policy.</p> <p>Our Communities have not consulted or agreed to be an energy island.</p>	<p>submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
99	Mr Nigel Ayliffe [2639]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1. Distance from Residential Property</p> <p>Considerable consultation took place on this point both with the public and the</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Councillors in the drafting and agreeing of the Supplementary Planning Guide. Despite this evidence of the will of the people it has not been included in the above Plan. It should not be ignored. The agreed minimum distances should be entered.</p> <p>2. Repowering of existing wind farms/turbines. The planning considerations for these should be the same as those for new proposed turbines otherwise the damage already done to the countryside and tourist attractions will be compounded with the new much larger turbines.</p>	<p>according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>case by case basis.</p> <p>The support for medium-scale wind farms / turbines on urban/industrial brownfield sites reflects the guidance within paragraphs 2.11 to 2.14 in TAN 8.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
100	Mr Christopher Marjot [2624]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1. Object to the classification of 50m wind-turbines as being 'small', this appears to be based more on power output, rather than height. The environmental and amenity impact is directly proportional to the height of the wind-turbine, not the power output. 50m wind-turbines are not 'small' relative to the size of dwellings and the local environment. The classification should be redefined to accurately reflect their scale relative to residences and</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>the local environment. *</p> <p>2. The Anglesey SPG on 'Onshore Wind Energy' recommended far more suitable distances from residences to wind-turbine the JLDP should conform with the SPG separation distances.</p>	<p>size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
131	Mr Mark Edwards [2769]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Wind turbines have been proven to discourage tourism. NW Wales is highly dependent on the business provided by its visitors. Any thing other than micro scale turbines must therefore be ruled out.</p> <p>The definition of a "small wind turbine" at up to 50m high o/a is badly judged. This is around 10x the ridge height of a traditional cottage.</p> <p>Distances from residences in table 14 are about 50% of what is reasonable.</p> <p>The words "significant harm" in clauses iii and iv of the conformation criteria fails to show due respect and consideration for the needs of local residents and needs amendment.</p> <p>Overall limitation to micro and domestic turbines requires amendment of items</p>	<p>Not Accepted - No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>1, 2 and 3.</p> <p>Table 13 needs to be changed to give realistic height categories.</p> <p>Distances in Table 14 should be doubled.</p> <p>Amended wording for criteria iii. and iv. given.</p>	<p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
166	Mr DAVID THOMAS [2775]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>After much consultation there is an SPG which has been agreed and accepted but does not seem to be implemented in the Deposit plan Why? There should be a minimum distance from residential buildings specified. What is there now to stop more turbines being erected across Anglesey. The island in my opinion is already saturated with wind turbines and any more will ruin it's character and attraction for tourist to come and visit.</p> <p>SPG provisions for wind turbines to be implemented.</p> <p>A distance of at least 1.5 km between residential property and a turbine to be specified.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
177, 194	Rod Dixon [2774], Mrs Irene Stott [2780]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>ADN1 point 2. This should refer to the agreed Onshore Wind Energy SPGs of both Councils which state that the maximum tip height for the designated sizes of turbines will be: micro - 11m; small - 20m; medium - 65m; large - 135m. The councils were assured that these would be carried forward to the LDP,</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
201	Kingsbridge Caravan Park (Mr Andrew Bate) [2778]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Onshore wind turbines on Anglesey should be restricted to "Domestic" use and located near the associated dwelling.</p> <p>Proliferation of larger machines around the island will have a negative impact on the landscape and may cause visitors to seek alternative less industrialised locations.</p> <p>There will be significant visual impairment with the construction of additional transmission lines associated with extra generation capacity from Wylfa B.</p> <p>Generation capacity from proposed offshore wind farms and Wylfa B will far outweigh that which onshore generation could achieve so preserve the onshore landscape of "unspoilt</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>No evidence has been presented by the objector to justify a restriction to Domestic scale throughout the Plan area.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism'</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>countryside and coastline" as highlighted in the Visitor Economy Introduction.</p> <p>Restrict onshore wind turbines to "Domestic" grade.</p>	<p>(February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p>Criterion (vi) in the policy refers to cumulative impacts which includes any prominent landscape features.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
299	Mr Owain Evans [2837]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>In 2012/13 Anglesey Council compiled, consulted and agreed a SPG which specified limits on the growth of wind turbines. This Deposit Plan completely ignores those decisions.</p> <p>I want to see the provisions of the SPG with respect to wind turbines and passed in 2012/13 to replace the JLDP provisions</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				contained in the Deposit Plan.	<p>included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
305	Mr Barry Roberts [2878]	POLICY ADN1	Object	I object to the plan as it classifies up to 3, 50 metre wind turbines as small scale. The plan also states most of Gwynedd is protected from developments by being a National Park (Snowdonia) or SLA (Lleyn Peninsular). Only Anglesey is open to wide-spread abuse, and it will be abused. There was an agreement that minimum distance would be considered by Anglesey	Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>planners and councillors after the 2013 SPG was adopted due to 8,000 strong petition demanding a minimum distance. Once again a minimum distance has been ignored. So much for democracy !</p>	<p>within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
312	Cyfeillion Llŷn (Mrs Sian Parri) [2871]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Ban turbines from the AONB. No turbine higher than 11.1 in the SLA and Landscape of Special Historical Interest. Listen to the advice of the AONB Consultative Committee which considers that it is necessary to adhere to the above in order to conform with the Council's statutory duty under the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.</p>	<p>Not Accepted – The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
388	Môn a Gwynedd Friends of the Earth (Mr Richard Mills) [2937]	POLICY ADN1	Object	ADN1 and the criteria in the associated Table 13 appear to restrict many wind energy developments of less than 5 MW to within SSAs and urban/industrial brownfield sites. This would be in contravention of TAN8, which states, "...the Assembly Government would support local planning authorities in introducing local policies in their development plans that restrict almost all wind energy developments, larger than 5 MW, to within SSAs and urban/industrial brownfield sites." We also consider ADN1 to be unsound in failing to take adequate account of the importance of community-based/-owned projects and repowering schemes.	<p>Not Accepted – The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan’s area.</p> <p>The conclusions of this work was that micro-scale and small-scale (up to 5MW) outside the AONB, SLA and the setting of the National Park and World Heritage Site could be supported. To ensure consistency with the evidence base we propose a focussed change to refer to the setting of the AONB and SLA.</p> <p>Therefore, the Plan supports proposals up to 5MW outside areas with a landscape designation or an area that affects their settings provided the criteria within the policy has been satisfied.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
477	CSJ Planning Consultants Ltd (Mr John Cocking) [1558]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The wording of the first line is unnecessarily restrictive. The wording of points 1, 2 and 3 is unnecessarily prescriptive. Both should be amended to reflect a more flexible and proactive approach to wind farm development. Applications should be determined on their merits on a case-by-case basis</p>	<p>Not Accepted – the wording within the policy reflects the evidence base contained within the Background Paper Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014). This reflects the extremely special environmental assets within the Plan’s area.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
531	John Bircham [2989]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Wind turbines have an unacceptable visual impact on a rural countryside. The concrete base for each turbine will be forever long after turbines have gone with the grants.</p>	<p>Not Accepted – The criteria within the policy have regard to the visual impact of a proposal and also that an appropriate restoration and aftercare scheme is in place.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
532	Jason Bowes [2991]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Although renewable wind energy is needed it is not needed in this format. Small wind turbines are not 50m. Maybe 10-15m. 15-30m turbines to be sited at least 1.5km from nearest dwelling. 30m turbines sited as wind farms as far from view as possible. I would not like Anglesey to be ruined by these monstrosities. Let farmers site small turbines 10-15m for their own needs.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
535	Brian Lee [2993]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1) The SPG should be honoured</p> <p>2) The existing height classification should be accepted</p> <p>3) A separation distance of 1.5km should also be accepted</p> <p>4) The JLDP should be re-written acknowledging the wishes of Anglesey residents</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
538	Janis Evans [2994]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The Deposit Plan ignores the Anglesey Council SPG which specifies limits on the growth of wind turbines. The Plan classifies 50 metre high wind turbines as 'small-scale'. The island's entire interior could be transformed by developments of this scale and type if the Plan proceeds. No other huge industrial scale developments are given such free reign.	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>8000 islanders who signed a petition in 2012 calling for a 1.5km separation distance between homes and industrial commercial turbines are being ignored.</p> <p>I want the provisions of the SPG with respect to wind turbines to replace the provisions contained in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have</p>

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

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

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
540	Tudweiliog Community Council (Mrs Glenys Peters) [1236]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Recommend that turbines that are higher than 15m should not be permitted in Gwynedd, and none in an Area of Natural Beauty. Tudweiliog Community Council objects to every wind turbine within the Llŷn AONB and every application for a turbine higher than 11m within the boundary and views of the AONB.</p>	<p>Not Accepted – The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan’s area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the evidence base there is an intention to change criteria 2 & 3 within the policy through including reference to the setting of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the AONB and SLA.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
541	Mrs Pam Lee [2725]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The following should be accepted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The 2012/13 SPG 2) A separation distance of 1.5km 3) Reclassification of 'small-scale' 	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
542	Dr Stephen Baker [2623]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The plan classifies 50metre high turbines as 'small scale'</p> <p>This means that most of the existing Anglesey turbines are 'small' - unreasonable</p> <p>Public consultation seems to be ignored</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
543	Richard & Sheila Perry [2996]	POLICY ADN1	Object	We object to the resizing criteria of turbines - 50 m high now being considered 'small scale'. In fact these are very visible from many locations across the north part of the island, the coast path and AONB. Visitors come to the island to enjoy the landscapes of	Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				the AONB/coast and are providers of much of the vital summer income for Anglesey's tourism businesses. They will not enjoy their visit if all they can see across the island are far taller wind turbines, more widely spread than at present.	<p>paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
544	Mr Stephen Kneale [2776]	POLICY ADN1	Object	This Plan completely ignores decisions which were agreed after exhaustive public consultation. The Plan classifies 50m high win turbines as 'small-scale' which is absurd. The existing industrial Rhyd-y-Groes Amlwch wind farm would be "small-scale". Anglesey would be	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>ruined as a tourists destination if further developments on this scale were allowed on the island. The height categories should be retained as specified in the existing SPG. The acceptable distance from dwellings should also be retained as specified in the SPG.</p>	<p>robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
545	Mrs Candy Jones [2758]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>50m high is not a small wind turbine. The SPG is being ignored. The whole interior of the island could be covered in 50m turbines if the Plan is adopted.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
546	Elfed Jones [2999]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Small turbines should be 20m high, as specified in the SPG, not 50m high. The SPG is being ignored after an unprecedented response. This Plan would turn the interior of the island into one big wind farm of 'small' 50m turbines.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>ii) Classifying 50m turbines as small is incomprehensible. It was agreed by residents that 'small' wind turbines (20/25m) should be allowed for farmers etc. 50m is not small, it is large industrial.</p>	<p>Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
548	Mr N.F. & Mrs C.W. Roberts [3000]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Common features are noise, the obvious blight on a landscape of natural beauty, and the significant effect on local businesses and local employment in catering and tourist industries.</p> <p>Turbines of the height proposed (up to 50m) will destroy views of the landscape and affect tourism.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
549	Mrs M.A. Ayliffe [3001]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>a) 50 metre high turbines are not classified as small in the SPG. They are 20/25m high</p> <p>b) The north end of the island has most of the 'small' turbines in clusters which will cause problems for the local residents as set out in the SPG if they are increased to 50 metres</p> <p>c) That the council is ignoring the SPG of 2012/13 which was decided upon after exhaustive public consultation.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
550, 552, 554, 559, 576,	Mr DJ & Mrs JL Hart [3002], Gareth Porter [3004], Ralph Morris [3005], Jonathon Tivy-Jones	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The Plan classifies 50m high wind turbines as 'small-scale', over 6 times the height of an average house. Most of the turbines in the existing wind farms in the north of the island are now 'small' and the island's entire interior can be transformed by developments of this scale and type if the plan proceeds. The SPG on Onshore Wind Energy, subject to exhaustive public consultations, is being thrown out.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
578, 688	[3010], G. Warren [3018], Julia Dobson [2979], Mrs Frances Nigogosian [3068]				<p>individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
551	Robert MacAulay [3003]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Paragraph 7.2 of policy ADN1 will have the effect of unconstrained building of large wind turbines across much of Anglesey. The two largest 'industries' on the Island are farming and tourism and the proposed policy will serve to destroy or seriously reduce the latter by ruining the peace and (largely) uninterrupted vista's for which most tourists come. Whilst the proposal may produce a little more green energy for the UK, it will only serve to enrich a few to the huge detriment of the rest of the island's inhabitants and visitors</p>	<p>Not Accepted – No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
555	Isabel Hargreaves [3006]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>In 2012/13 Ynys Môn agreed an SPG with specified constraints on wind turbines which the Deposit Plan has ignored. It has re-cast 50m turbines as 'small', the implications of this for future wind turbine development is huge and will have a deleterious effect on the natural rural beauty of the Island. Potential impact on tourism and quality of life of Ynys Môn residents will be significant and negative.</p> <p>8000 residents responded to the SPG consultation calling for a 1.5km separation between commercial turbines and residents.</p> <p>The provision of the 2013 SPG to replace the provisions within the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
556	Vicky Gregory [3007]	POLICY ADN1	Object	Onshore wind energy of the Plan states that 'small-scale wind energy proposals WILL be granted outside the AONB, SLA and the setting of the National park and World Heritage Site'. The Plan's classification of 'small scale' win turbine is 50m in height which is considerably higher than the classification held in the	Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>2013 SPG. This has worrying implications for the island's future with the possibility of unspoilt landscapes being dramatically changed for years to come and areas in the north will continue to be industrialised on an even larger scale and dominate the landscape.</p>	<p>within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
557	John Alexander [3008]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The SPG and the amendments subject to consultation is being ignored. The re-classification of the scale of size of wind turbines will enable repowering smaller turbines in the north of the island. It will enable turbines to spread across the whole county (this is against TAN8 guidelines. No mention of buffer zones/wildlife corridors that can protect the key AONB areas. The SPG is being ignored. The distance of turbines from properties that are quoted and would trigger an assessment are not acceptable and do not meet the public's requirements.</p> <p>The SPG that was passed in 2012/13 plus the amendments should replace the JLDP provisions in the Deposit Plan. Health and safety issues with regard to noise need to be properly taken into consideration. A buffer zone and wildlife corridor from the south to the north east of the island needs to be created. Turbines should not be permitted in this area. 50m turbines are</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>not small and they are unsuitable for the topography of this island.</p>	<p>2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
558	Sarah Irlam [3009]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The Plan classifies 50 metre high wind turbines as 'small'. If the Plan proceeds, almost the whole of the island will be covered by developments of this scale. The SPG on onshore wind energy is being dismissed.</p> <p>I want to see the provision of the SPG with respect to wind turbines passed in 2012/13 to replace the JLDP provision contained in the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>The landscape sensitivity and capacity for Anglesey, Gwynedd and SNP needs to be adhered to.</p> <p>The Deposit Plan must protect these special areas and more should be included, particularly the distance from AONB, SSSIs, SLAs, SACs.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The policy is based upon the evidence base in the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) which assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB provided criterion (i) to (vii)</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>are satisfied.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
560	Mr John E. Williams [3013]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>No attempt made to differentiate between Anglesey and Gwynedd in terms of constraints imposed by topography on planning applications emphasised by National Park and AONB. This impacts directly on land available for turbine planning applications. Approximately 20% of Gwynedd is not covered by either National Park or AONB. Approximately 80% of Anglesey is not covered by its AONB. The burden</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The evidence base to include this policy is in the background paper Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) which assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				of repeated applications the energy companies therefore falls on Anglesey with the coast implications and the reduction of services borne by the Anglesey rate payer.	<p>individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
561, 572	Dr B L Davies [3012], Mrs E C Davies [3017]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The provisions of the SPG have not been incorporated in this Deposit Plan. Nearly 8000 residents signed a petition against the further development of commercial scale (>15m to tip) wind turbines on the Island.</p> <p>New wind turbine development outside the area specified in para. 7.2.30 of the</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Plan should be restricted to domestic scale turbines (<15m to tip) and should relate well to existing settlements/buildings and not scattered over open countryside.</p> <p>The only exception would be the repowering of existing turbines which should be replaced one-to-one by more efficient and less noisy turbines of the same height.</p>	<p>base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
564	Christopher and Eleni Marjot [3011]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The Anglesey SPG on 'Onshore Wind Energy' recommended far more suitable distances from residences to wind turbines. These have not been applied in the draft JLDP. I want the JLDP to conform to the recommendations for separation distances to follow that of the Anglesey SPG.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
565, 567	Jonathan Tivy-Jones [3010], Mrs Erica Cooper [3015]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>I object that the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Onshore Wind Energy SPG 2012/13 which was agreed after much public consultation is now ignored. Also ignored, is the petition by 8000 residents in 2012, who wanted a 1.5 km separation distance of commercial turbines, from residential areas for reasons of safety and aesthetics. This deposit plan has now re-classified 50 metre wind turbines as small-scale! How can they be called small when they are twice the height of the Marquis of Anglesey's Column? This plan, therefore, will pave the way for Anglesey's beauty to be disfigured, by</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
566	Mrs Nanette Tivy-Jones [3014]	POLICY ADN1	Object	In 2012/2013 Anglesey Council compiled, consulted and agreed an SPG which specified certain limits on the growth of wind turbines. This deposit plan does not comply at all with these decisions. This new deposit plan would reclassify wind turbines already present on the north of the island as small and would allow the interior of the island to	Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
568	Mr John E. Williams	POLICY ADN1	Object	Table 14 is unrealistic. Uses a visual impact criteria which does not include cognitive, psychological and mechanical	Not Accepted - As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	[3013]			<p>implications. The separation distances have been tailored to fit the largest possible turbines into the confined areas available on Anglesey and Gwynedd without adequate reflection of practices elsewhere in Britain and abroad. This section needs to be re-titled as a Physical/Mental Impact Zone and the concerns of the 8000 rate payers who signed the petition of 2012 adequately reflected. 1.5km separation distance should be adopted.</p>	<p>findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C).</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
577	Trevor Jones [3019]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The plan ignores the previously agreed SPG limiting the growth of wind turbines. it will, if adopted, give free rein to unfettered development of large win turbines on an industrial scale. it cannot be allowed that this Guidance should be ignored.</p> <p>Changes: the proposals regarding the height and distribution of wind turbines contained therein be removed and replaced by the recommendations as</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p>

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
580	Dr Morag McGrath [231]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The 2013 SPG set out a minimum separation distance from residential or tourist properties of 500m or 20 times the tip height of the blades, which the greater. The SPG has been totally ignored in this document. Table 14 refers only to the visual impact whereas the problem of noise is also relevant.</p> <p>Change: Reinstate the policies concerning minimum separation distances between onshore wind turbines and residential or tourist properties given in the 2013 SPG.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
581	Nigel Peacock [3021]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Wind turbines other than domestic wind turbines should not be permitted anywhere in the plan area.</p> <p>Changes: the plan should give protection to the environment and countryside not only in relation to the provision of holiday accommodation but also in relation to the construction of much more damaging wind turbines.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
582	Mr David G. Thomas [3020]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>I object to the parameters set for wind turbines on Anglesey. They do not include the restrictions agreed in the Strategic Planning Guidelines passed by A.C.C. On 24th. January 2013 and confirmed to be included in the LDP by the Joint Local Development Panel on 7th. March 2014. The LDP does not have regard to the effect of wind-turbines on the sky-line of Anglesey and the tourist industry on which it is so much dependent. Restrictions should be clear to avoid inappropriate applications and expensive appeals. The Plan as drawn is ripe for exploitation by rich developers</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
583	Mr Ralph Morris [3022]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Anglesey Council agreed a SPG which specified limits on the growth of wind turbines. This plan completely ignores those decisions. The plan classifies 50 metre high wind turbines as small-scale, over 6 times the height of an average house! As if by magic, most of the turbines in the existing wind farms in the north of the island are small, and the island's entire interior can be transformed by developments of this scale and type if the plan proceeds. No other huge industrial scale developments are given such free rein.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
584	Gillian Coates [3023]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The Deposit Plan will turn Anglesey into a giant wind farm. I object to 50 metre wind turbines being defined as 'small-scale'.</p> <p>Change: I want to see the provisions of the SPG with respect to wind turbines, and passed in 2012/2013, to replace the JLDP provisions contained in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
585	Mr David G. Thomas [3020]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The LDP does not have regard to the effect of wind-turbines on the sky-line of Anglesey and the tourist industry on which it is so much dependent.	Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				Restrictions should be clear to avoid inappropriate applications and expensive appeals. Change: i) Insert "Small-scale and" before "medium scale..." ii) "Micro-scale" - delete "and small-scale" wind turbines....outside the AONB insert "or a buffer zone of two kilometres", SLA iii) Policy AND2 "All proposals should conform to the following criteria: vii At end after "agreed" Add "before the commencement of any works".	<p>different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
586, 587	Philip Tolman [3024], Honey Tolman [3025]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The Plan ignores the SPG which sets limits on wind turbines. Absurdly, the Plan classifies 50m turbines as small scale. Anglesey's rural beauty could be destroyed forever by massive developments that would never be permitted for other industrial projects. The SPG adopted a 1.5km separation distance between homes and large	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot</p>

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
588	Janet Smith [2990]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Objection: To the re-classification 50 metre high wind turbines as 'small-scale'.</p> <p>Objection: To the consequence of this re-classification that existing wind farms in the north of the island would be 'small', opening the way for the transformation of the Island to large scale industrial development.</p> <p>Objection: The Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy, subject to exhaustive public consultations, is being thrown out.</p> <p>The provisions of the SPG with respect to wind turbines and passed in 2012/13 to replace the JLDP provisions contained in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
589,	Dorothy Prestwich	POLICY ADN1	Object	Object to large (50m +) turbines being built all over the Island. SPG has been	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
590	[3026], Mr & Mrs K Street [3027]			totally ignored.	<p>about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
591	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mrs Maureen Parry Williams) [1441]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Policy ADN1 is flawed planning policy for Anglesey and is unsound.</p> <p>A policy that restricts the areas where new wind turbines can be built is essential for Anglesey.</p> <p>The SLA status must be restored to most of the island's interior landscape.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The objector wants to see the entire centre of Anglesey designated as a Special Landscape Area (SLA) as it was in the Isle of Anglesey's Local Plan. In paragraph 5.3.11 of Planning Policy Wales, it is explained that non-statutory designations, such as Special Landscape Areas, should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the site's value in terms of nature, landscape or geology.</p> <p>The SLA identified in the Plan is based on the work of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>The heights of permissible new turbine developments must be reduced to those listed in the 2012 SPG Consultation.</p> <p>There must be Buffer Zones between turbines and residential properties as per the 2013 SPG.</p>	<p>the Review of Gwynedd and Anglesey Special Landscape Areas (2012). Whilst the centre of the Island had been identified as a SLA in the Local Plan, it was not in the UDP and it stopped identifying any part of the Island as an SLA. The objectors have not submitted evidence to justify designating the entire centre of the Island as a SLA, contrary to the findings of the Plan's evidence base and consequently, no recommendation to change the Plan is made.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
593	Lawrence Cotter [3028]	POLICY ADN1	Object	The 2013 SPG is ignored. 50 metre wind turbines which are double the height of	Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>the Marquis of Anglesey's Column, now classed as 'small-scale', with no public consultation.</p> <p>Change: the provisions regarding onshore wind turbines that were agreed in the SPG 2013 document should be upheld and maintained in the Plan.</p>	<p>and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
596 & 601	Cwm Cadnant Community Council (Mr Alun Foulkes) [1273]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Policy ADN1 in its present form does not show good judgement. It will have a detrimental impact and is not a sustainable environmental, social, economic and cultural land use plan for Anglesey.</p> <p>Point 1 should restrict turbine height to 50 metres to blade tip. Point 2 should restrict turbine height to 15 metres to blade tip. Point 3 should restrict turbine height to 11.1 metres to blade tip.</p> <p>The criteria listed in i) to vii) should be expanded to offer better protection to</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Whilst criteria (i) to (vii) refers to national assets they are also applicable in addition to local assets e.g. landscape character, biodiversity etc.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				local as well as national designations and assets.	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
603	John & Ann Baum [3031]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The 2012/2013 SPG on Onshore Wind Energy is being ignored.</p> <p>50 metre high turbines are being classified as small-scale - at six times the height of an average house.</p> <p>Many existing turbines on wind farms on the island would be classed as small, thus opening up possibilities for extensive industrial type developments.</p> <p>We should like the 2012/2013 SPG provisions applied to wind turbines to replace the JLDP proposals contained in the Deposit Plan.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
608	Mr Paul Madden [3032]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>As worded criteria (iii) is bad English and it would appear that words may of have been omitted and the word 'significant' should be dropped.</p> <p>The Health Impact Assessment refers to minimising potential health impact caused by noise but not detailed policies in regard to health impact is included within this section.</p> <p>There is no recognition that wind turbines and their proximity can result in ill-health for residents.</p> <p>The report on separation distances is concerned only with landscape and visual matters. The Council should of have commissioned an independent report to deal with ill-health from noise emissions.</p>	<p>Accepted in part – Agree that criterion (iii) could be re-worded to better explain that factors such as noise, public health etc. will be factors to consider with any proposal.</p> <p>The term significant is a term used in Planning and it is felt appropriate to keep it within the policy.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>It is not felt appropriate for the Councils top</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>commission work on health impact from noise when this information is a requirement on individual applications. Since the effects from noise will be different from location to location it is reasonable to conclude that undertaking such a study on a county level would provide definitive answers, and therefore this would not be an effective use of resources.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That criterion (iii) be re-worded.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF35</p>
690	Mr John Irlam [3069]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Minimum separation distances should be considered as noted in 'Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties Study'. Wind turbines in close proximity to dwellings would have an adverse effect. The JLDP should recognise the separation distances.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on ‘Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)’. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
694	Mrs Kate Barker [2857]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The document is unsound because some policies appear to be made on inaccurate generalisations, and there is not enough detail on some issues, for example, the importance of the landscape around heritage assets - there is no mechanism to show these areas on the constraint maps. The document is also unsound because it does not take into account previous public consultation responses on the LDP where 800 people wrote in about their concerns in wind turbine development in 2012.</p> <p>1. Public consultation period should be</p>	<p>Not Accepted – The public consultation period is set out within Part 4 of the Town & Country Planning (LDP) (Wales) Regulations 2005. The Deposit Plan was consulted upon for 6 weeks in line with this regulation.</p> <p>It is assumed that the reference to maps is in relation to the constraints maps that provided information about the different landscape/ environmental designations that exist within the plan area e.g. AONB etc. These are not part of the consultation, but rather for information and different designations have been prepared at different scales and therefore not appropriate to be seen at a lower scale.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>extended.</p> <p>2. Maps should be re-issued so they do not pixilate when you zoom in.</p> <p>3. Height of wind turbines not exceeding 15m to tip height should replace 50m stated in the plan.</p> <p>4. A set back distance from dwellings should be observed of 1.5 or 2 kilometres because of health and loss of amenity.</p> <p>5. We need a mechanism and clear route for appeal against the grant of approval in planning decisions other than through the courts.</p> <p>6. The area surrounding the heritage asset should also be shown as a protected area on the constraints maps, not the just the asset itself.</p>	<p>assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons – Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>The appeal system and changes to it our outside the remit of a planning development plan process.</p> <p>Different types of heritage assets would have different size of area that effect their setting. In light of this it is not appropriate to show an area around heritage assets as areas to be protected.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan. No Change
705	Lesley Alexander [3073]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Community Council views and objections to the spread of medium and large industrial turbines are ignored in the JLDP. Wildlife corridors and buffer zones around the AONB are not included. The effects on tourism and visual impact on the landscape will be catastrophic on Anglesey unless the JLDP is amended. The separation distance from domestic dwellings is suggested to be 400m from a large turbine! A petition in 2012, done as part of the SPG consultation asked for 1.5km.</p> <p>The deposit plan must be changed to include the SPG amendments on turbines, their height classification, separation distances and effect on tourism, wildlife and health of local inhabitants e.g. noise.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Criterion (ii) gives consideration to the effects on biodiversity which will include wildlife corridors.</p> <p>A buffer to the AONB was introduced in the Ynys Môn SPG for On-shore Wind Energy on the day the SPG was adopted. Planning Inspectors have not been giving weight to this buffer from the AONB, see the appeals on applications 37C174C (Tre Ifan, Brynsiencyn) and 38C277B (Caerdegog Uchaf, Llanfechell). In addition, the AONB management plan does not identify a specific distance as a buffer from the designation. The effects of a proposal on views in and out of the AONB will depend upon the nature of the proposal and the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					No Change
706	Gwyneth Jones [3074]	POLICY ADN1	Object	I object to the scale proposed in relation to the height of proposed turbines within a landscape such as that of Anglesey, especially given the developments that have already taken place. I would welcome adopting the previous policies found in the 2013 SPG	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>All applications will have to be considered on an application by application basis in order to have regard to the factors that are applicable to each individual proposal. The cumulative impact can be an important factor in some areas on Anglesey where existing development has been built or has received permission.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
711	Anglesey Against Wind Turbines (Ms Mairede Thomas) [318]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>Policy ADN1 is flawed, unjustifiable and unsound for the reasons given in Section 2c of the JLDP representation form.</p> <p>There should be separation distances between turbines and homes. Especially to lessen the effect of noise on housing in the vicinity.</p> <p>The SLA status should be restored to the interior landscapes of Anglesey.</p> <p>Table 13 should use the turbine heights used in the 2012 SPG.</p> <p>Any policy on wind turbine development must take account of the depressive economic impact on houses and other property and on the island's economy and its tourist trade in</p>	<p>Accepted in part – it is agreed to include a reference to house amenities used by visitors. However, further changes are not accepted for the following reasons.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>particular.</p> <p>The protections for tourism amenity contained in the 1996 Ynys Môn Local Plan must be included in any policy regarding wind turbines.</p>	<p>commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>The objector refers to a number of examples where noise impact of wind turbines on nearby houses and is a reason for introducing separation distances. The view of the Welsh Government (WG) in Planning Policy Wales and TAN 8 is that ESTU-R-97 should be used to assess the noise impact of any development (including any cumulative impact) on nearby houses. A letter dated 25 November 2015 from the WG which specifically refers to TAN 11 mentioning ESTU-R-97 in six supplementary guidance notes that have been published to support the guidance and that further work on amplitude modulation is currently taking place.</p> <p>As part of the evidence base for the Plan, work was</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>undertaken on 'Wind Turbines and Pylons– Guidance on the Application of Separation Distances from Residential Properties (2014)'. The findings of this work concluded that there was no conclusive evidence to support the application of the minimum separation distances between residential properties and wind turbines or pylons in terms of visual residential amenities. For this reason, it was recommended that every proposed development should be considered on its own merits on a case by case basis. Although strict separation distances are not recommended, it is considered that the use of indicative distances to commence a visual residential amenity assessment (it is possible that there are visual impacts on a very large scale within this), is a valuable tool to identify any location where a visual residential amenity assessment should be undertaken to note the potential unacceptable impacts in terms of visual residential amenities. This has been included within the explanation for policy ADN 1.</p> <p>The objector has not submitted valid reasons or clear evidence to justify the inclusion of separation distances between turbines and houses; therefore, no change to the policy is recommended for this.</p> <p>The objector wants to see the entire centre of Anglesey designated as a Special Landscape Area</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>(SLA) as it was in the Isle of Anglesey's Local Plan. In paragraph 5.3.11 of Planning Policy Wales, it is explained that non-statutory designations, such as Special Landscape Areas, should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the site's value in terms of nature, landscape or geology.</p> <p>The SLA identified in the Plan is based on the work of the Review of Gwynedd and Anglesey Special Landscape Areas (2012). Whilst the centre of the Island had been identified as a SLA in the Local Plan, it was not in the UDP and it stopped identifying any part of the Island as an SLA. The objectors have not submitted evidence to justify designating the entire centre of the Island as a SLA, contrary to the findings of the Plan's evidence base and consequently, no recommendation to change the Plan is made.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>As a matter of general principle, planning is concerned with land use from the point of view of the public interest and is not concerned with private rights as such.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p> <p>The purpose of clause (iii) of the policy is to outline strategic support for wind energy developments outside designated landscapes, but also to list matters that should not be subject to substantial harm as a result of the development. This list includes residential amenities but does not refer to tourist use, which is what the objector wishes to see. An assessment of any application for a turbine would</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>assess its impact on any building in the vicinity, be that a residential or tourist building. The Plan's employment evidence base outlines the importance of the tourism industry in the Plan area and that the industry has a number of various facilities across the countryside in the Plan's area. In light of this, and to ensure consistency with Strategic Policy PS11 (The Visitor Economy), it is recommended that clause (iii) is changed to read 'residential or house amenities used by visitors'.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Change clause (iii) to refer to house amenities used by visitors.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF35</p>
713	Mr John Eric Williams [2746]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>The term 'Wind Turbines' rather than 'Windmills' should be used. The term 'windmills' is associated with corn mills.</p> <p>Paragraph 2. I completely disagree with the proposal to permit wind turbines outside the AONB, the National Parks and SLAs if these are visible from these sites. This type of development could be</p>	<p>Accepted in part – Accept that the reference to 'melinau' in the Welsh version should be amended to 'tyrbinau'.</p> <p>From reviewing the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment study it is clear that when referring to Landscape Protection the setting of the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>just as harmful to the site.</p> <p>Paragraph 3. I completely disagree with the proposal to permit domestic wind turbines within the AONB, National Parks and Heritage Sites.</p> <p>These recommendations are contrary to existing policies and weaken and undermine efforts to safeguard the heritage that is in our care.</p>	<p>AONB and SLA is listed in addition to the setting of the National park and World Heritage Site. In light of this it is recommended that the wording within the policy is amended through including reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA in criterion 2 & 3.</p> <p>The evidence base to the Deposit Plan within the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) study assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The term 'tyrbinau gwynt' replace 'melinau gwynt' in the Welsh version and that criterion 2 & 3 contain reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF35, NF36</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					Minor Change NB5, NB6, NB7
894	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>A limit of 11m rather than 15m height for domestic turbines would accord better with permitted development limits. Difference between capacity and output should be clarified. We oppose removal of the present progressive and clearcut policy in Gwynedd of excluding wind turbines from the AONB. Support the proposal to limit turbines to domestic size in SLAs - should emphasise this includes within AONB's. SLA coverage should be extended to buffer some areas of the AONB which are less protected in N.Llyn and the Menai shore. Height limits should apply in repowering. Residential visual amenity distance criteria should be strengthened. Farm diversification criteria from the Gwynedd SPG should be included in the policy. There should be more reference to archaeological impact and a definition of community-based projects. Suggested changes:</p>	<p>Accepted in part - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>ADN1/2: "...outside the AONB, SLA, and the SETTINGS OF THE AONB, National Park..."</p> <p>ADN1/3 "In the AONB, SLA and the SETTING OF THE AONB, National Park and World Heritage Site..."</p> <p>Extend SLA coverage to provide more effective buffer areas for designated area.</p> <p>In area LCA GU10 follow LSCS guidance in limiting turbines to 'micro' scale.</p> <p>ADN1/3 delete 'the AONB'</p> <p>Add ADN1/4 "Wind turbine applications in the AONB will be refused"</p> <p>4.17 Para 7.2.30 Insert 'acceptable'?</p> <p>'The setting of the National Park and World Heritage Site limits the ACCEPTABLE..."</p> <p>Table 13:Domestic height limit, clarify kW as a capacity not output; reduce 'small' indicative output level.</p> <p>Add criteria related to farm usage limits, archaeological impact</p> <p>Modify residential amenity distance</p>	<p>The objector wants to see the Special Landscape Area (SLA) extended. In paragraph 5.3.11 of Planning Policy Wales, it is explained that non-statutory designations, such as Special Landscape Areas, should be soundly based on a formal scientific assessment of the site's value in terms of nature, landscape or geology.</p> <p>The SLA identified in the Plan is based on the work of the Review of Gwynedd and Anglesey Special Landscape Areas (2012). Whilst the centre of the Island had been identified as a SLA in the Local Plan, it was not in the UDP and it stopped identifying any part of the Island as an SLA. The objectors have not submitted evidence to justify designating the entire centre of the Island as a SLA, contrary to the findings of the Plan's evidence base and consequently, no recommendation to change the Plan is made.</p> <p>From reviewing the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment study it is clear that when referring to Landscape Protection the setting of the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				limits.	<p>AONB and SLA is listed in addition to the setting of the National park and World Heritage Site. In light of this it is recommended that the wording within the policy is amended through including reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA in criterion 2 & 3.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That criterion 2 & 3 contain reference to the setting of the AONB & SLA.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF35</p>
950	AONB Joint Advisory Committee (Cynghorydd Gruffydd Williams) [3090]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>I believe that the current policy of having no turbines in the AONB (C26) should be adhered to.</p> <p>Also, refuse turbines higher than 11m within visibility of the AONB.</p> <p>The term 'turbine' should be used, rather than 'mill' which is different.</p> <p>I believe that criterion 2 should refer to safeguarding the setting of the AONB.</p>	<p>Accepted in part – Accept that the reference to 'melinau' in the Welsh version should be amended to 'tyrbinau'.</p> <p>From reviewing the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment study it is clear that when referring to Landscape Protection the setting of the AONB and SLA is listed in addition to the setting of the National park and World Heritage Site. In light of this it is recommended that the wording within the policy is amended through including reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA in criterion 2 & 3.</p> <p>The evidence base to the Deposit Plan within the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>There is concern about the categories and designating developments under 5MW as 'Small'.</p>	<p>Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (2014) study assesses the appropriateness of different types of turbine typology in different parts of the Plan's area.</p> <p>It concluded that proposals for domestic scale development (up to 15m to the blade tip) could be supported in the AONB and SLA provided criterion (i) to (vii) are satisfied.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>The term 'tyrbinau gwynt' replace 'melinau gwynt' in the Welsh version and that criterion 2 & 3 contain reference to the setting of the AONB and SLA.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF35, NF36 Minor Change NB5, NB6, NB7</p>
686, 700	Mr RONALD BOYLE [2672], Linda Boyle [3071]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What will be the justification for 'trigger' mechanisms to determine cumulative impact? Who decides? 2. The negative visual impact of one wind turbine in an area where none previously existed could be considered as a 100% deterioration - how/who will determine the level of impact? 3. The downgrading of turbine heights, so that 50m is now considered small is a serious weakening of previous guidance, as is the reduction in visual amenity assessment distances. 4. 8000 signatories on Anglesey, expressed the wish of a minimum of 1.5km separation distance with large wind turbines and residences, none is given. 5. Trigger factors to determine visual, amenity cumulative impact etc must be 	<p>Not Accepted – Consideration regarding the impact of a proposal will be based upon a professional judgement over the evidence submitted as part of any application. Since all wind turbine applications are different it is not believed possible to have a trigger mechanism rather they should be dealt with on an application by application basis.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>made transparent.</p> <p>6. There must be a separation distance and any permitted should carry a bond to enable decommissioning.</p>	<p>developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Criterion (vii) within policy ADN 1 refers to an appropriate land restoration and aftercare scheme that all applications should conform to.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
707	Susan Talbot [3075]	POLICY ADN1	Object	<p>1. The plan classifies 50 metres high wind turbines as 'small-scale', over six times the height of an average house!</p> <p>2. Most of the turbines in the existing wind farms in the north of the island are now 'small', so the island's entire interior will be transformed by developments of this scale if the plan proceeds.</p> <p>3. 8000 signatories on Anglesey expressed the wish of a minimum of 1.5km separation distance with large wind turbines and residents. None is given.</p>	<p>Not Accepted – The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
64	Mr M Saxton [2647]	7.2.32	Object	50 metres high cannot possibly be described as small scale, I. E. 3 x50 metre turbines, each as high as a 12 or 13 storey tower block of flats is actually	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>ENORMOUS, not small. There seems to be no consideration given to the adverse health effects of this useless form of energy. We expect our local council to respect and preserve the well being of its constituents, so, much greater separation distances have to be legislated for</p> <p>No large 50 metre turbines to be described as small ones.</p> <p>Much greater separation distances to assist in the health and well being of anyone unfortunate to reside within a couple of miles of any wind turbine</p>	<p>different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
85	Institute of Biology (Ms Elspeth Wagstaff) [1496]	7.2.33	Object	<p>The definitions of types of wind turbines has been changed drastically from that published by IoACC in the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The effect is to put huge wind turbines into the Medium category when previously they would have been regarded as Large.</p> <p>Numbers of turbines in each category are not required as it implies that such quantities will be acceptable when even one turbine is an eyesore.</p> <p>Please reinstate the following wind turbine definitions as from your own document: Microgeneration: 10 - 18 metres</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>Small: 12 - 25 metres Medium: 15 - 50 metres Large: over 50 metres</p> <p>Delete numbers of turbines from the table.</p>	<p>Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
91	Mr Jon Cottrell [2734]	7.2.33	Object	<p>The adopted Anglesey SPG stated that Medium turbines were 15 - 50 M total height the proposed JDP has re-designated this as Small.</p> <p>The adopted SPG stated that Large turbines started at 50+ M total height</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				<p>the proposed JDP has re-designated this to start at 110 M - twice the height adopted in the SPG!</p> <p>Keep to the agreed SPG and listen to the 8000 residents of Anglesey who signed the partition in 2012.</p>	<p>Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
178, 195	Rod Dixon [2774], Mrs Irene Stott [2780]	7.2.33	Object	<p>The agreed Onshore Wind Energy SPGs of both Councils state that the maximum tip height for the designated sizes of turbines will be: micro - 11m; small - 20m; medium - 65m; large - 135m.</p> <p>The councils were assured that these would be carried forward to the LDP, they have not been and the new categories are much increased over the originals.</p> <p>Revert to original agreed size bands as agreed in SPGs.i.e micro - 11m; small - 20m; medium - 65m; large - 135m.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
569	Mr John E. Williams [3013]	7.2.33	Object	<p>Definition of scale seems to have been drawn by the Energy Companies. Turbines larger than domestic or micro would transgress the criteria. The emotive use of the word 'industrial' is avoided. Any turbine larger than 'micro' must be 'industrial' so the word should be re-instated. No mention of impact on tourism.</p> <p>Changes: Re-draft table 13 to reflect terminology which describes the turbines in relation to the topography of Anglesey. Reinstate the word 'industrial' to describe the function of turbines larger than micro. Include statement that any 'industrial' turbine development would not be considered as favourable to tourism.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>No sound evidence has been published which displays a substantial impact on tourism in an area due to the impact of wind turbines. There is an announcement on the website of the WG referring to 'The Economic Impact of wind farms on tourism' (February 2014) which concluded that evidence proving that wind farms are having an impact on tourism in Wales is scarce.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
573	Angela Williams [3016]	7.2.33	Object	<p>Any wind turbine that is not domestic, should be properly described as 'industrialised', so that its true purpose be evident. Object to the redefining of medium-sized units as 'small' for the reasons I have outlined, and the use of the word 'micro' to describe a >65 ft structure.</p> <p>Changes: reinstate correct and helpful terminology, to distinguish domestic units and industrialised commercial units. Amend table 13 to reflect realistic size description.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - The height used within the policy is consistent with what is included in the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment' Background Paper. An assessment is included in this topic paper about the suitability of different heights within the different landscape character areas. Therefore, the policy reflects the evidence base in the background paper and the different typology that could be considered within landscape character areas within the area of the Plan. Introducing different heights within the policy would mean that the Plan would not have a robust evidence base to justify limiting the size of developments within different sub-areas within the area of the Plan.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
1066	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.2.33	Object	Table 13 - Two of the supplementary criteria are very similar 'large/ very large', clarity required on the difference between these two.	<p>Accept – Agree that the criterion in relation to 10 or more wind turbines in the typology for Large and Very Large is confusing. To ensure that there is a clear difference the reference to number of turbines should be taken out of the Very Large typology.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That the reference to the number of turbines as a criteria be taken out of the Very large typology.</p> <p>Focussed Change NF36</p>
1069	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	7.2.34	Object	While the Welsh Government supports the principle of securing sustainable community benefits for communities through voluntary arrangements, they must not impact on the decision making process and should not be treated as a material consideration unless it meets the tests set out in Circular 13/97.	<p>Not Accepted – The purpose of this paragraph is to highlight the principle of obtaining community benefit with wind turbine developments rather than introduce it as a material planning consideration.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
92	Mr Jon Cottrell [2734]	7.2.37	Object	<p>The published Separation distances published in the Anglesey SPG are being totally ignored and were more appropriate to Anglesey than these proposals</p> <p>Keep to the agreed SPG and listen to the 8000 residents of Anglesey who signed the petition in 2012.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
				properties to prevent a free-for all situation on Anglesey.	<p>a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
179	Rod Dixon [2774]	7.2.38	Object	<p>The separation distance is arbitrary and no better than the agreed distances in the existing SPGs which were supposed to be transferred to the LDP.</p> <p>Use the separation distances as agreed in the Anglesey SPG</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability</p>

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
196	Mrs Irene Stott [2780]	7.2.38	Object	<p>The separation distance is arbitrary and no better than the agreed distances in the existing SPGs which were supposed to be transferred to the LDP and should be used.</p> <p>Use the separation distances as agreed in the Anglesey SPG</p>	<p>Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
571	Angela	7.2.38	Object	The Gillespie Report is flawed by	Not Accepted - Reference is made to the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Onshore

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
	Williams [3016]			<p>reliance on mathematical exactitude, rather than regarding the consideration of amenity as being people-based. Responses to the SPG of 2012/13 not considered.</p> <p>Changes: i) Take consideration of the provisions of the SPG ii) separation distances in the Gillespie Report must be disregarded due to limitations of their research.</p>	<p>Wind Energy that was adopted in 2013 in Anglesey and this should be used for this policy in the JLDP according to the objector. SPG 2013 was a guideline for Anglesey's existing policies and not a new document that leads policy in the new Plan. Guidance to prepare a LDP is clear that there is a robust evidence base with a Sustainability Assessment of its policies. As a result, the SPG cannot be used as policy in the JLDP. Instead, the evidence base for appropriate matters must be assessed to be included in the policy.</p> <p>There is an intention to prepare a new SPG for the Plan's Renewable Energy policies, see Appendix 9 of the Deposit Plan for details.</p> <p>Evidence of the level of objection to the SPG is being submitted from approximately 8,000 objectors who wish to see a separation distance of 1.5km between commercial turbines and housing. This was included in the SPG during a meeting of the Full Council that adopted it. As this was not subject to a public consultation, planning inspectors have not placed weight on it when determining appeals for wind turbines (see applications 38C267B and 38C185C). The objector refers to the desire to introduce</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendations
					<p>separation distances by the Petitions Committee in 2012. However, the Welsh Government responded that separation distances would be inflexible and would prevent renewable energy projects and that it was better to determine applications locally on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>

ADN2 – Other Renewable Energy Technologies

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
182, 183	Ellesmere Sand & Gravel Company Limited [2686]	POLICY ADN2	Object	Consider this policy is repetitive of national policy e.g. (not all landscapes are of the same value). The policy is too restrictive and not positive toward renewable energy technologies on existing mineral extractions sites or	Not accepted – there are very special environmental assets in the area, which have been recognised and designated on a national and international level. Therefore, the area attracts a vast number of tourists / visitors, who make an important contribution to the

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
	Lafarge Tarmac Trading Limited [2735]			<p>toward previously used land</p> <p>Remove reference to development boundaries. Reference to temporary use of renewable energy sources on existing mineral extraction sites and positive emphasis toward renewable energy sources on previously used land</p>	<p>local economy.</p> <p>Whilst Renewable Energy policies promote renewable technology or low carbon initiatives, it's important that such developments don't compromise the area's biodiversity or landscape designation objectives.</p> <p>Policy ADN1 'On-shore Wind Energy' refers to medium-scale wind farms/turbines (5MW to 25MW) on urban brownfield/industrial sites which could include mineral excavation sites. For any other type of renewable energy, policy ADN2 may support large-scale proposals in exceptional circumstances, where an overriding need for the scheme can be justified.</p> <p>Whilst the policy is more supportive of developments within development</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
					<p>boundaries, it does not seek to keep developments within such boundaries. Rather, the policy outlines the need for appropriate evidence to justify settings outside the development boundary.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
656	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY ADN2	Object	A separate explicit policy is needed for solar energy proposals which should prioritise use of commercial and farm building roofs, presume in favour of micro-solar field arrays in suitable sites and allow larger scale arrays in rural	Not accepted – The Unit does not believe that there should be a separate policy for solar energy.

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				<p>areas only outside the AONB and SLA and only in exceptional circumstances where the site has good natural screening and is not overlooked from nearby higher ground.</p> <p>Change: Add explicit policy covering field solar arrays.</p>	<p>The current criteria within the policy, together with national policies regarding the AONB and the Plan's policy for the SLA (AMG1) means that any impact as a result of a solar proposal application would be carefully considered.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
878	Mr John Tripp [252]	POLICY ADN2	Object	<p>Carbon management not emphasised enough. Aim for zero emissions. Example - Wiltshire.</p>	<p>Not accepted – Policy PCYFF 4 within the Plan is in relation to Carbon Management. This policy is subject to change in relation to additional text over the need for an energy assessment to support applications.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>

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

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

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
1059	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY ADN2	Object	Policy ADN2 seeks to constrain non-renewable energy technologies to within development boundaries. This is overly restrictive and contrary to national planning policy. The energy assessment should provide the evidence to plan positively for all forms of renewable and low energy development.	<p>Not accepted – It is believed that the objector has misinterpreted the policy. Whilst the policy is more supportive of developments within development boundaries, it does not seek to keep developments within such boundaries. Rather, the policy outlines the need for appropriate evidence to justify settings outside the development boundary.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Robust evidence was not received to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No Change</p>
93	Mr Jon Cottrell [2734]	7.2.45	Support	Solar PV is far more acceptable than wind energy because the shear height of the turbines will totally dominate the landscape for miles around and have a	Note the supporting comment

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer Comments and Recommendation
				negative impact on tourism.	<p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

ARNA1 – Coastal Change Management Area

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
760	Bangor Civic Society 1 (Don Mathew) [2988]	POLICY ARNA1	Support	Policy ARNA1 Coastal Change Management is supported.	<p>Supportive comment is noted</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>
762	Bourne Leisure Ltd [2768]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	Policy ARNA1 is endorsed in principle. A policy that seeks to address shoreline management issues and objectives should fully reflect the outcomes of early engagement with landowners and also, ensure sufficient flexibility to allow for coastal landowners and business operators to	Not accepted – criterion 7 of Policy ARNA1 facilitates proposals to redevelop or extend property or intensify uses on current sites that are within coastal change management areas, subject to evidence regarding risks to people and property. Policy TWR3 facilitates proposals to relocate current static

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
				relocate buildings and other facilities to open space within existing sites, or to land immediately adjoining their landholdings, where necessary due to coastal erosion. It should refer expressly to allowing landowners and business operators to contribute to funding for, and to retain coastal defence, in accordance with national policy for contributing to funding, as well as providing and maintaining defences.	<p>caravan or chalet sites that are in coastal change management areas.</p> <p>The Policy refers to new defences or replacing previous ones. In this respect, it is believed this clause is sufficient without having to add a reference to who will fund the work.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No sufficiently robust evidence was received to justify revising the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No change</p>
771	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	Criterion 8 significance of .(outside the indicative policy epoch up to 2025) ? Clarify under what circumstances these non-residential developments (beach huts, shops, camp sites, etc.) will be permitted. We have been unable to locate online the CCMA maps. The maps in the Shoreline Management Plan show the location of coastal sections, but not the width of the affected management areas extending back from the coast. Criterion 3- Either	<p>Partly accepted – It is agreed the wording of criterion 8 is unclear. It refers to new non-residential developments on sites within an area where the adopted Shoreline Management Plan states there is to be 'no active intervention' or 'managed realignment' or both until 2025 and during 2026 - 2055. The second policy period was selected to reflect the possibility a development application could be submitted before the end of the life of the Plan, meaning starting on it during the final year of</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
				cleared or made safe. (rather than .and.)	<p>the Plan's life.</p> <p>Only the Shoreline Management Plan maps are available are present. It is intended to look into the ability to provide an appropriate level of information in the Plan's Limitations Map for the adoption stage.</p> <p>It is agreed that 'a' should be included at the end of criterion 3.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Revise criterion 3 by adding 'a' to the end of it. Revising criterion 8 to clarify it. Revising paragraph 7.2.49 to explain that the policy is relevant to the first two policy periods of the Shoreline Management Plan, namely up to 2025 and from 2026 to 2055.</p> <p>Focussed change NF37, NF38</p> <p>In order to improve the clarity of the Plan</p>
864	Haulfryn Group Ltd	POLICY ARNA1	Object	Paragraph 8(i) refers to camping sites but does not refer to holiday caravan sites. Where holiday caravan sites are located in CChMA it appears	Accept – it was not intended in 8(i) to provide an exhaustive list of the kinds of non-residential developments directly linked with the coast that

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
	[2986]			that the existing wording does not allow holiday caravan sites, but only camping sites. The wording should be amended to include holiday caravan sites.	<p>could be acceptable on a site within an area forecast to be at risk during 2026 - 2055. Even so, it is agreed that adding a reference to holiday caravan sites would improve understanding of the policy. Applications for this kind of development would be subject to a number of other policies in the Plan, e.g. Policy TWR3 or Policy TWR4.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Revise the wording of criterion 8(i) to refer to holiday caravan sites.</p> <p>Focussed change NF38</p> <p>To ensure the clarity of the Plan.</p>
865	Haulfryn Group Ltd [2986]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	Where holiday parks are located within the coastal change management area (within the AONB) and relocation of pitches is required due to roll back position from the shoreline, a minor increase in the number of pitches should be allowed to assist with funding the re-location of holiday pitches.	<p>Accepted – see the response to objections to TWR3</p> <p>Recommendation – revise Policy TWR3 to refer to a small increase in the number of plots, subject to evidence of the proposal's viability.</p> <p>Focussed change NF54</p> <p>In order to ensure the Plan is consistent internally.</p>
872	Friends of	POLICY	Object	We wish the policy to make it clear that ARNA1	Not accepted- after the Plan is adopted an Annual

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
	Borth-y Gest (Tom Brooks) [3036]	ARNA1		relies strictly on the CURRENT definition of the "West of Wales Shoreline Management Plan 2". We note that in the WWSMP that Borth y Gest is clearly marked as "hold the Line" and benefits from this policy until at least 2055. We consider that the policy should make clear that after the local plan is adopted, any subsequent change to the WWSMP2 will not change the areas to which ARNA1 would apply.	<p>Monitoring Report will be published. That report will record progress against a series of indicators in the monitoring framework. It will also record significant changes in local, regional or national circumstances that are relevant to the Plan's strategies and policies. If there were any significant change in the Coastline Management Plan, then Policy ARNA1 would need to be reviewed. It would be necessary to consult on any changes in policy due to the monitoring or review work.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No sufficiently robust evidence was received to justify revising the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No change</p>
940	Cyng/Counc Alwyn Gruffydd [381]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	The plan needs to be more coordinated. It is not rational to note an area as one which is at risk of flooding on one hand, while on the other noting the numbers of houses which the area requires. That the West Wales Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) 2 needs to be considered and the plan should be aligned with it.	Not accepted- The Plan does not have housing designations within settlement boundaries inside the Coastal Change Management Area. Policy ARNA1 does not support new housing within the Coastal Change Management Area, e.g. Fairbourne. The requirements of Policy PS5, Policy PS6 and Policy PCYFF1, as well as Planning Policy Wales and NCT 15

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officers' comments and recommendations
					<p>would be relevant to proposals for new housing in flood risk areas.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No sufficiently robust evidence was received to justify revising the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No change</p>
1070	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	POLICY ARNA1	Object	<p>The Policy is supported in principle but would benefit from minor editing to ensure clarity. Clause 1 - suggest insertion of "predicted to be" immediately before "threatened", to ensure link to SMP. Clause 2 - clarify whether proposals must meet both sub-clauses (i) and (ii), or either one of the sub-clauses. Clause 6 - it is not clear why the requirement for NRW consent is specific and unique to this clause. Clause 8 - The text within brackets is unclear, as it appears to suggest that after the first policy epoch (2025) certain developments would be acceptable. It is not clear how that fits with a plan with an end date of 2026.</p>	<p>Accept – It is agreed the Policy would be clearer if minor changes were made.</p> <p>It is agreed the Policy needs to be made consistent with the Shoreline Management Plan by referring to the possibility of being under threat. It is agreed it should be made clearer whether all the criteria are relevant and there is no detailed reference to the requirements of NRW. Editing the policy by referring to non-residential developments as a whole would make the policy more readable. It is believed there is a need to differentiate between areas where short term risk is forecast and areas where medium term risk is forecast.</p>

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