

APPENDIX A – CHAPTER 8 & APPENDICES

Chapter 8 - Monitoring and Implementation

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer response and recommendation
361	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	8.1	Object	With reference to theme 5 we suggest further indicators are included to enable the impact of the Plan to be fully and accurately assessed. The trigger levels should also be adjusted to reflect the fact that NRW do not object on matters affecting locally important habitats or species.	<p>Accept – Include an additional indicator to refer to LNR and Wildlife Sites as well as LBAP habitats.. Additionally remove reference to NRW where appropriate.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Amend Theme 5 as referred to above.</p> <p>Focussed change</p>
1065	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	8.3	Object	<p>Further consideration should be given to the following areas of the framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * the phasing of the development sites, their delivery, relevant triggers and associated action points. * targets and triggers should be included to ensure that key factors are delivered. * arrange the chart to ensure that the WG core output indicators relate to the local output indicator. * where appropriate, amend core indicators to reflect local circumstances. 	<p>Accept – it is agreed that the framework should be improved to include relevant sustainable development indicators and core indicators set out in the LDP Manual.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Amend the framework as referred to above.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer response and recommendation
				* Consider the implications of the recently published Sustainable Development Indicators to be collected from April 2013 onwards and the ongoing LDP Process Refinement Exercise should be considered	Focused change NF99, NF102, NF104 – NF110
1064	Welsh Government (Mr Mark Newey) [1561]	8.5	Object	It is unclear why the authority has decided to have two separate monitoring frameworks (para 8.5).	<p>Accept – it is agreed that the section would benefit from minor re-drafting to clarify matters.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Amend introductory text in accordance with the above.</p> <p>Focused change NF100</p>
479	Home Builders Federation Ltd (Mr Mark Harris) [1470]	8.8	Object	Theme 4 Indicator D26 Policy Target states: The rate of development does not exceed the 2,604 units in the 2011 to 2018 period. This appears to be a phasing policy which is not clearly stated in the policy sections of the document. We have objected to this elsewhere in our comments ID:130. Remove the split housing target which is effectively a phasing requirement.	<p>Partly accept – having considered the matter Theme 4 would benefit from a clearer reference to the need to deliver a 5 year land supply and the sustainable development indicators and core indicators.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>Amend text in accordance with the above.</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Officer response and recommendation
					Focussed change NF108
847	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	8.8	Object	I agree with the monitoring indicators for public transport (D4, D6,D7) however I disagree with the indicator D5 for a decrease on car journey times. Why is one of the indicators a decrease in journey times? The faster cars travel the more fuel they use and the more dangerous the journey. Also increases the likelihood of people using cars rather than buses. Also an indicator should be the public transport network is retained as it is or increased the number of buses has not declines, but increased. The times available for bus services are e.g. early morning and late buses enhanced.	Partly accept – amend to refer to facilitating more sustainable modes of transport. Recommendation Amend text in accordance with the above. Focussed change NF103, NF104

Appendices

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
478	Welsh Highland Railway (Mr Graham Farr) [254]	Schedule of Key Documents	Object	The assessment of Candidate Site submission ref: SP870 appears to have been undertaken in isolation from that of closely related Candidate Site submission ref: SP552 (copies attached). The address should be the same (Welsh Highland Railway Ltd. trading as Welsh Highland Heritage Railway) and the proposed use also better described as tourism. Access would be through that site, not independently of it. Should not the policy approach '... judging ... against the policy/criteria ... in the adopted development plan.' also be similar?	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>Whilst consideration has been given to these two sites together, given that they were submitted as separate sites, the sites have been divided as such. Accept that there is a link between the two sites, however it is considered that only site SP552 is appropriate to be included within the Porthmadog development boundary.</p> <p>It is noted that Policy TWR1 is relevant in this instance. Whilst priority is given to developing visitor attractions and facilities within development boundaries, it does not prohibit development outside development boundaries when that is relevant.</p> <p>It is noted that site SP870 is a long and narrow linear extension into the countryside and as such it is believed that its inclusion within the development boundary would be inappropriate, especially when considering the implications in relation to other JLDP policies, such as the housing policies.</p> <p>Recommendation</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No change</p>
474	Mr Geraint Evans [2962]	Schedule of Settlements	Support	<p>Re: Botwnnog - Field SP433: Agree with this potential site. Central to the village, direct access from the site either to the B4413 highway or to a quieter road before joining the B4413. A footpath already exists from this site all the way to the village centre and to both schools. Botwnnog is an ideal village to develop as there are so many facilities e.g. a primary and secondary school, a surgery, a shop, a cafe, a church and a chapel.</p>	<p>Note comment – This is housing allocation T61.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>
676	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	Schedule of Protected Sites or Areas	Object	<p>Apart from in Appendix 7, there is no reference to the Landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest and little to the Heritage Coast, both of particular importance to protecting the heritage of Western Llŷn.</p> <p>The Heritage Coast and Landscapes of Outstanding Historical Interest should receive more mention.</p>	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>Registered Historic Landscapes are considered in Policy AT1. It is noted that the Heritage Coast is considered in Policy AMG 3. It is noted that the Registered Historic Landscapes and the Heritage Coast are shown on the constraints map in relation to the Joint LDP.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan. No change
363	North Wales Wildlife Trust (Mr Chris Wynne) [2626]	Schedule of Proposed Supplementary Planning Guidance	Support	We support the inclusion of the SPG on Biodiversity but ask for clarification as to whether the Gwynedd SPG has been formally adopted by the Council. We note the proposal to revise, update and extend the SPG within 18 months of the Plans adoption	Note comment – The Supplementary Planning Guidance's that are related to the Gwynedd UDP have been adopted by Gwynedd Council. This includes the SPG in relation to 'Wildlife Sites'. Recommendation No change

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
610	Mr Paul Madden [3032]	Schedule of Proposed Supplementary Planning Guidance	Object	<p>Appendix 9 inadequately describes the existing SPGs which are currently in force and which in light of the new plan will need revising.</p> <p>A full list would allow responders to refer to the SPGs to understand the implications of the plan on their contents.</p> <p>Unclear if reference is made to the current SPG on Onshore Wind Energy which was subject to extensive consultation and comments in 2013. Its content should of have been acknowledged as feeding into the formulation of policy ADN1.</p> <p>Need a full list of current SPGs and whether they are to be revised or be replaced.</p>	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>The Supplementary Planning Guidance list noted in Appendix 9 refers to the proposed new guidance that will be prepared to support the Joint LDP policies. The currently adopted Guidance will therefore not be relevant in relation to this Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that the ‘Locating stand-alone renewable energy development’ SPG will be relevant for on shore wind energy developments. It will provide information to support Policy ADN1. In relation to this SPG, it is noted in Appendix 9 that “current adopted SPG (Gwynedd and Anglesey) will be revised and updated within 18 months of the Plan’s adoption”.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No change</p>

General comments

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
563	Mr John E. Williams [3013]	General Comments	Object	<p>In its present form the representation procedure is not accessible to a large number of Anglesey and Gwynedd residents. Some have neither the means or ability to access the form on line and the form when accessed does not communicate at a level which they can comprehend. The form may well be acceptable to planning departments and energy companies but represents 'official speak' which the average person does not subscribe to. In that it need to fulfil a function as a consultation document its availability and the way it is laid out must be far more user friendly.</p>	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>The internet is a way to enable a vast amount of people to see the Plan, accept however that not everybody has access to it. Paper copies of the Deposit Plan were available to see in libraries and Council Offices during the consultation period. Information regarding the key stages within the Plan's preparation have been advertised in relevant newspapers. Also, for instance, everybody that have shown an interest in the Plan are notified and updated at key stages through e-mail or letter.</p> <p>An attempt was made to make the Deposit Plan and the relevant connected documents as easy as possible to follow in terms of their language and the way that they have been set out.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>There was no compelling evidence 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	Comments and recommendations of officers
570	Angela Williams [3016]	General Comments	Object	<p>The Plan is only available online and this is discriminatory. The important issue of tourism is omitted.</p> <p>Changes: i) Information pack to every household by post ii) Application forms to be available at post offices iii) Freepost option iv) Potential adverse effects of having multiple wind turbines in 'tourist' areas must be included as a valid planning consideration.</p>	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>Paper copies of all documents relating to the Joint LDP are available, including therefore the Deposit Plan.</p> <p>Documents are available in libraries and Council Offices.</p> <p>The level of resources makes it difficult to directly contact everybody within the Plan area. It is believed that every effort has been made to publicize the relevant stages within the Plan making process and the associated documents in a way that is as effective as possible.</p> <p>Accept that alternative advertising and consultation methods could be considered in the future.</p> <p>No robust evidence has been published 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</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>tourism in Wales.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>There was no compelling evidence to justify amending the Deposit Plan in order to ensure the soundness of the Plan.</p> <p>No change</p>
595	Age Cymru Gwynedd a Mon (Stephen Williams) [3030]	General Comments	Object	<p>We urge both Council's to ensure that due consideration is made to the commitment agreed in the Dublin Declaration and support the overarching aims identified in the Ageing Well in Wales programme when considering future planning and developmental policies in Anglesey and Gwynedd.</p>	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>Note the comment. It is believed that the Plan considers and satisfies the needs of older people effectively.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>There was no compelling evidence 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	Comments and recommendations of officers
597	The Coal Authority (Mr James Smith) [2998]	General Comments	Object	<p>The Coal Authority has reviewed the available documents and has identified a number of matters it would wish to see addressed.</p> <p>Suggested Changes Full consideration should be given to areas of planning policy interest to the Coal Authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · the safeguarding of coal in accordance with the advice contained in Minerals Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales; · the establishment of a suitable policy framework for energy minerals including hydrocarbons in accordance with the advice contained in Minerals Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales; and · ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduces the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in Planning Policy Wales and MTAN2 in Wales. 	<p>Not accepted – The sections relating to minerals within the Plan reflect the current policy guidance within Chapter 14 of Planning Policy Wales (2016) along with MTAN2. It isn't appropriate for the Plan to repeat national policy.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p>No Change</p>
665	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	General Comments	Object	<p>Agricultural Sheds Summary - an explicit policy is required regarding agricultural sheds comparable to GUDP D9. Farmers need these, but they are large structures being built in increasing numbers in rural areas. Presently planning scrutiny of shed applications appears weak and more attention needs to be given to the siting, colouring and type of materials used.</p>	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>Permitted development is applicable to a number of agricultural buildings. If planning permission is required for an agricultural shed, relevant information can be seen in Planning Policy Wales and Technical Advice Note 6 (especially part 6).</p> <p>Policy PCYFF2 is relevant when</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
					<p>considering the visual impact of agricultural sheds.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p>No Change</p>
748	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	General Comments	Object	<p>Health Impact Assessment - this document fails to mention the potential main impact to health in the area which is the building of a new nuclear power station. The risk is not just to the current communities but the future population of the area. I would like to contest to the completeness of this document because it does not include the possible impact of a nuclear disaster at the power station and during transport of radioactive waste.</p>	<p>Not Accepted - As the introduction section to the strategic policy on proposals for large infrastructure projects points out the development consent orders for development such as the new nuclear power station would be dealt with outside the Local Development Plan process.</p> <p>Matters in relation to health issues with such a project will be one of the issues the Planning inspectorate will consider as part of its examination of the proposal.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p>No Change</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
756	Mr Rob Booth [3033]	General Comments	Object	<p>Housing: there should be more housing that is part of a housing association. The policies should emphasize the requirement for social and mixed housing. All housing developments should include a proportion of social housing i.e. houses that belong to housing associations.</p>	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>The important role that Housing Associations have in providing houses to meet specific local needs, is supported.</p> <p>Policy TA19 provides the thresholds for providing affordable housing, including a pro rata payment where providing an affordable unit is not possible. It is important that the type of housing provided meets the identified needs, including therefore for social and intermediate housing.</p> <p>Whilst it is important to provide the appropriate mix of housing, this is dependent upon specific circumstances. It cannot be insisted that a Housing Association is part of every housing development. It is also likely that there would be financial implications for housing associations in terms of this.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan’s soundness.</p> <p>No Change</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
910	Campaign for the Protection of Rural Wales (Mr Noel Davey) [1169]	General Comments	Object	We find the JLDP draft less well structured, less concise and less coherent than the current GUDP in respect of presentation, emphasis and prioritisation of policies. Provide link to GUDP, including analysis of GUDP performance, reasons for changes in approach and emphasis. Provide additional, more specific but more concise policies for each type of planning development on model of GUDP. Improve style and presentation, proof check punctuation and grammar. Exclude jargon. Simplify language. Matrix relating relevant JLDP policies to each type of planning proposal.	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>The Joint LDP will not include a policy for every type of development. Neither will it repeat national policy guidance.</p> <p>It is not possible for the Plan to consider all types of development. A list of all the policies is noted in Appendix 8.</p> <p>Whilst some technical terms have to be used, it is noted that Deposit Plan and associated documents attempt a simple style as often as possible. It is noted that the Plan will be proof read.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p>No Change</p>
971	Cyngor Cymuned Llanrug. (Mr Meirion Jones) [3134]	General Comments	Support	Llanrug Community Council is satisfied with the Plan.	<p>Note supporting comment</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No change</p>

Rep ID	Name	Section	Type	Summary of Representation / Change(s) to Plan	Comments and recommendations of officers
1822	Mr Thomas Conway [3371]	General Comments	Object	<p>The Deposit Plan is too large, impracticable and fragmented for public consultation. All the information for Anglesey and Gwynedd has been combined meaning the documents are extremely log. Both counties are different with different needs and need different policies to suit them. There is a lack of cross referencing within the documents and a representation form that is not fit for purpose. A 6 week consultation period is grossly inadequate, whilst available in libraries they are not open all of the time.</p>	<p>Not accepted –</p> <p>It is noted that the method of preparing the Plan corresponds with the relevant regulations. It is very important that the Plan's content is based upon extensive and comprehensive evidence.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>No robust evidence was received which would justify amending the Deposit Plan to ensure the Plan's soundness.</p> <p>No Change</p>