



---

## Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymchwiliad a gynhaliwyd ar 26/9/18 i 28/9/18  
Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 26/9/18 & 3/10/18

gan Iwan Lloyd BA BTP MRTPI

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 05.02.2019

## Appeal Decision

Inquiry Held on 26/9/18 to 28/9/18  
Site visit made on 26/9/18 & 3/10/18

by Iwan Lloyd BA BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 05.02.2019

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/T6905/A/17/3188913**

**Site address: Land at the corner of Pentwyn Road and Marl Lane, Deganwy**

**The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr M Roberts Beech Developments (NW) Ltd against the decision of Conwy County Borough Council.
  - The application Ref 0/43059, dated 23/06/2016, was refused by notice dated 16/10/2017.
  - The development proposed is residential development comprising 110 no dwellings and associated works including roads, sewers, public open space and landscaping.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for residential development comprising 110 no dwellings and associated works including roads, sewers, public open space and landscaping at Land at the corner of Pentwyn Road and Marl Lane, Deganwy in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 0/43059, dated 23/06/2016, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the conditions set out in Schedule 1 below.

### Procedural matters

2. On 5 December 2018 and after the close of the Inquiry Planning Policy Wales (PPW) Edition 10 was published and replaced PPW 9 with immediate effect. The main parties were given an opportunity to comment on the implications of PPW 10 on the appeal development and on each other's comments in this regard. I have taken all of these comments into account.
  3. An executed Section 106 Planning Obligation dated 20 September 2018 was submitted at the Inquiry. The obligation concerns contributions to off-site highway improvements, open space, waste, allotment sites and libraries and is considered further below.
  4. During the course of the planning application revised plans were submitted. As these were considered by the Council, no prejudice arises in dealing with the appeal having regard to these revised plans. The main parties agreed the list of revised plans.
-

## Main Issues

5. The main issues in this case are:

- Whether the proposal accords with planning policies that seek to control new development outside settlement boundaries;
- The impact of the proposal on the setting of heritage assets and the historic landscape;
- Whether the proposal would result in the unacceptable loss of best and most versatile agricultural; and
- Whether the lack of a 5-year housing land supply is a consideration sufficient to outweigh any conflict with local and national planning policies.

## Reasons

### *Settlement boundaries*

6. The appeal site relates to agricultural land located immediately adjacent to the settlement boundary of Llandudno Junction/Deganwy, with existing housing on its north-west, west, south-east and southern sides. The proposed housing development is situated outside the green wedge. The north-eastern side of the site is bounded by agricultural land and green wedge. The proposed development's drainage balancing pond extends partly across this field. Marl Lane and Pentwyn Road borders two sides of the site and the junction of these roads meet at the west corner of the site.
7. The Conwy Local Development Plan (LDP) 2007-2022 was adopted in October 2013. The LDP's key strategy is to prioritise future development within the strategic economic hub locations of Conwy, Llandudno, Llandudno Junction and Colwyn Bay and within and on the fringe of settlements closely linked to essential facilities and services, and accessible to the strategic road and rail network.
8. LDP Policy DP/2 indicates that development will be located in accordance with the overarching strategic approach whereby 85% of new housing will be located within, and on the fringe of the urban areas. The policy goes on to indicate that urban areas will be the key in the provision of a combination of market and affordable housing for local need (AHLN).
9. Policy DP/1 C would permit development provided that it is consistent with the principles of sustainable development and all development is required to accord with national guidance in line with Policy DP/6, be consistent with the sequential approach to development having regard to DP/2, and, amongst other things, conserve or enhance the quality of buildings, sites and places of historic, archaeological or architectural importance in line with Policy CTH/1.
10. LDP Strategic Policy HOU/1 requires that over the period 2007 to 2022 the Council will plan, monitor and manage the delivery of approximately 6,520 new dwellings (at an average annual rate of 478 new dwellings) inclusive of completions, commitments, windfall and new allocations. The policy gives priority to locating new development in line with Strategic Policy DP/1 – 'Sustainable Development Principles' and the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy DP/2 – 'Overarching Strategic Approach'. The policy states that outside the urban settlement boundaries, no further housing development will be permitted, except to meet AHLN on exception sites adjoining Llanrwst in line with Policies HOU/2 – 'Affordable Housing for Local Need' and HOU/6 – 'Exception Sites for Affordable Housing for Local Need'.

11. The development is outside the urban settlement boundary and is therefore contrary to Policy HOU/1 where no further housing is permitted. Policy HOU/1 has set settlement boundaries based on the calculation that the housing requirement figure over the plan period can be met within those boundaries.
12. However, the housing land supply situation which is set out further below is at a significant shortfall from the plan-led housing requirement figure. The obligations to maintain a 5-year supply of housing land as required by PPW 10 paragraphs 4.2.10 and 4.2.15, and Joint Housing Land Availability Studies Technical Advice Note 1 (TAN 1) paragraph 2.1 is currently not being met.
13. PPW 10 seeks the delivery of sustainable development, balancing and integrating social, economic, cultural and environmental considerations. Paragraph 1.17 states that a plan-led approach is the most effective way to secure sustainable development through the planning system and it is essential that plans are adopted and kept under review. The LDP review is somewhat off and the replacement plan delivery agreement contains an indicative adoption date of 2021.

*Heritage assets and the historic landscape*

14. The heritage assets identified as being affected by the appeal development are Bodysgallen Hall listed building (Grade 1), Bodysgallen Registered Historic Park and Garden (Registered Grade 1), and Deganwy Castle Scheduled Ancient Monument and listed building (Grade II\*), and the Historic Landscape. The cumulative effects of the appeal development on these assets have also been considered.

*Policy and statutory provisions*

15. In relation to the listed buildings the statutory provision of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 Section 66(1) says that 'In considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, the local planning authority, or the Secretary of State shall have special regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses'.
16. In relation to the Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) the provisions of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979 provides no statutory protection to the setting of a SAM.
17. PPW 10 paragraphs 6.1.10 - 6.1.13 provides guidance on listed buildings, paragraphs 6.1.18 - 6.1.19 on historic parks and gardens, paragraphs 6.1.20 - 6.1.21 on historic landscapes, and paragraphs 6.1.23 - 6.1.27 on archaeological remains. Planning Policy Wales Technical Advice Note 24 (TAN 24): The Historic Environment provides further guidance. Paragraph 4.2 of TAN 24 sets out that when considering development proposals that affect SAMs there is a presumption against proposals which would involve significant alteration or cause damage, or would have a significant adverse impact causing harm within the setting of the remains. Paragraph 7.2 of TAN 24 indicates that local planning authorities should protect and conserve parks and gardens, and their settings, included in the register of historic parks and gardens.
18. Paragraph 1.25 of TAN 24 sets out that the setting of an historic asset includes the surroundings in which it is understood, experienced, and appreciated embracing present and past relationships to the surrounding landscape. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the

ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral. Setting is not a historic asset in its own right but has value derived from how different elements may contribute to the significance of a historic asset. Similarly the published guidance on Setting of Historic Assets in Wales May 2017 indicates that the importance of setting lies in what it contributes to the significance of a historic asset.

19. LDP Strategic Policies CTH/1 and CTH/2 seek to preserve or where appropriate enhance heritage assets and their settings.

*CADW's response on the application/appeal*

20. CADW in its letter dated 10/01/2018 and in response to the appeal expressed concerns about the accumulative damage and the threat of urban sprawl on the setting of Bodysgallen Hall and important views from it. CADW refers to direct views of the development from the lower terrace and from the Hall tower which are important elements of the overall composition, and whilst self-seeded trees do provide some screening of the development from other parts of the Hall and grounds these are not part of the original planting scheme, and if there was ever a desire to return to the original arrangement, the inappropriateness of the proposed development would be impossible to ignore. CADW's concerns also relate to the unimaginative modern housing estate layout and indicate that a lower density development and more substantial planting should have been considered. CADW indicate that the proposal would be damaging to the setting of the listed hall and its historic complex.
21. In an earlier letter from CADW dated 4/05/2017, it indicated that the proposed development will not cause significant damage to the setting of any scheduled monument, that the development will cause moderate, but not significant damage to the setting of the Bodysgallen Registered Historic Park and Garden, and slight adverse impact on the outstanding universal values of the world heritage site.

*Bodysgallen Hall (BH) Grade 1*

22. BH is a grade 1 listed building and is noted as an exceptionally well-preserved C17th gentry house with successive additions in the early C20th that makes a coherent architectural whole of remarkable character and consistency. BH is constructed on an elevated platform with extensive views of the surrounding Bodysgallen Registered Historic Park and Garden (BRHPG) itself registered grade 1, and within its grounds are a number of ancillary buildings that are listed Grade II (former stables, barn and granary, bailiff's house, former dovecote, terrace walls, gates and garden walls). BH comprises a three-storey house with five-stage central tower. The date of the central tower has not been firmly established but CADW favour the C17th. The house was enlarged in a consistent Tudor-Gothic style with a north and north-east wing and latterly in C19th and early C20th with extensions to the south. The significance of the building is derived from its evolution as a heritage asset, its historical association with the Mostyn family, its aesthetic and communal value. BH was converted to a hotel in the late C20th and is run by the National Trust.

*Bodysgallen Registered Historic Park and Garden (BRHPG) Grade 1*

23. BRHPG is an exceptional terraced and walled garden on different levels. It includes a long terrace walk providing superb views, a large rose and kitchen garden partly dating to the C18th, the remains of a landscape park and large areas of oak woodland. The significance of this asset is derived from its physical form and setting believed to be contemporary with the construction of BH in the C17th. The long terrace walk was constructed at the top of the slope to the south-west of the house and reported by

Pennant in 1782 to have views to Conwy from the long terraced walk over the tops of trees.

*Deganwy Castle (DC) SAM and grade II\* listed building*

24. DC SAM occupies two hilltops and saddle of The Vardre. The SAM is defined tightly around the lower slopes of the hillocks. The listed building comprises the ruins of a medieval castle a former defensive fortification constructed before Conwy Castle. It is reported that the castle was built there in 1080, and was destroyed in 1210; it was refortified and again destroyed in 1241. It was again refortified before being destroyed in 1263. The significance of the asset derives from its evidential value its historical past and aesthetic importance as a dramatic hill top location commanding views across the estuary and Conwy and is also valued communally by the network of footpaths and historical and archaeological publications.

*Historic landscape*

25. The appeal site is within the Creuddyn and Conwy Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest (LOHI). Gwynedd Archaeological Trust (GAT) was commissioned by the appellant to produce an Assessment of the Impact of Development on the Historic Landscape (ASIDOHL2). GAT produced a comprehensive document and assessed Historic Landscape Character Areas (HLCA) within the broader LOHI. GAT considered Creuddyn, Deganwy/Llandudno Junction, Conwy and Bryn Pydew HLCAs. The Council disagrees with elements of the ASIDOHL2 assessment.

*The contribution the setting has to the significance of the heritage assets*

26. During the course of my visits, I viewed the appeal site from the BH tower, from the terraced walk of the BRHPG, from DC and The Vardre and from surrounding footpaths close to the site and those within the BRHPG traversing towards the obelisk and down to the A470. Several photomontages and photos have been produced from both parties and these I have considered carefully in the light of my extensive site visits.
27. The setting of BH is complex and multi-tiered. It is viewed within the essential setting of the BRHPG and outwards from the adjoining parkland and the wooded hillside of East Covert. The setting of the BRHPG and the footpaths within the woodland are experienced to some degree in the context of traffic noise from the A470 at the foot of East Covert hill. In other aspects of the experience BH has an immediate and enclosed relationship with the BRHPG given that it is heavily wooded and planted on the top of the hill and down the slopes of the hill. In all, the immediate setting of BH is quite enclosed and there is little physical and visual recognition of the wider setting beyond the A470 that is of the built settlement of Llandudno Junction.
28. When viewed from the tower there is an expansive view either side of the stairwell entrance of the settlement towards Conwy, the mountains behind, the estuary and the wooded slopes in the foreground. The view is panoramic and as the receptor moves around the tower viewing point different elements of the view is experienced. One such view is towards Deganwy, The Vardre, DC SAM hillocks and the surrounding agricultural landscape. Another is towards Gloddaeth and the surrounding pasture and wooded slopes; another is the wooded foreground with Llandudno and Llanrhos in the background. The appeal site can be viewed from the tower, but that does not mean that setting is affected. The appeal site is some 600m from BH in the overall composition of the view the site is a small component of the overall available view. Beyond the woodland of the BRHPG there is a field which provides separation in the view between the planted slopes of BRHPG and the landscaped boundary of the appeal site. The site is seen within the context of ribbon development above and a block of

residential development below and to one side. DC SAM hillocks are an angled view to the side of the higher ribbon of residential development. The appeal site is to one side and lower than this view towards DC SAM, secondly the view of the appeal site is largely contained by existing development.

29. The listed DC remains are not visible in this view. Whether or not there was an intention to capture the view from BH tower to DC cannot be conclusively determined, there is no historical functional evidence of this, however, the view towards the appeal site is strictly not in the same frame as the view to DC SAM because it is lower and largely enclosed by residential development on three sides. In all, the view of the proposed development would not result in a negative contribution to the setting of BH or the significance of the BH. This is due to the panoramic scale of the setting experienced across a very wide area from the tower viewing point. I conclude that the ability to appreciate and understand the special architectural and historic interest of BH would not be diminished by the proposal and the impact on the overall significance of BH would be neutral.
30. From BRHPG, the key view from the terraced walkway is towards Conwy Castle. This view is over the Woodlands site which was recently granted planning permission and Llandudno Junction with the mountains in the background. It is a filtered view due to the wooded foreground, but no part of the appeal site can be seen in this view because of the direction it faces. As the receptor walks around the terraced walkway there is another view towards DC SAM and The Vardre. The Council note that this is a central and channelled view of the appeal site towards DC. The view is of an agricultural landscape with a ribbon of development at the foot of rising ground comprising The Vardre and DC SAM beyond. However, the site might be central in the view, but it is heavily filtered by established landscaping along field boundaries. The angle of the view means that the appeal site is barely seen and cannot be read as forming part of a swathe of agricultural and historic landscape. The proposed development would make no negative contribution to the setting and significance of the BRHPG because of its obscurity. Other factors such as traffic noise diminish the experience of the setting of the BRHPG. The visual experience of a receptor looking at an historic agricultural landscape is tempered by this other sensory and negative contributor to setting.
31. I conclude that the proposed development given its obscurity in one peripheral part of one element of the setting of the BRHPG would have a neutral impact on the setting and significance of BRHPG.
32. From DC SAM and listed building ruins no part of the proposed development would be seen from the western hillock or from the saddle, obscured by the agricultural swathe of land of The Vardre. From the eastern hillock the view of the site is a very small sliver in the overall panoramic views which are obtained. The ribbon of residential development on the top part of the appeal site can be seen because of the presence of a large white rendered property. The appeal site is barely noticeable in the broader ambit of the overall view. The proposed development would be a very small element of the view at distance and would be seen in the context of other built development with a curtain of established landscaping in front and to the rear of the site.
33. The Council indicate that the proposed development would appreciably increase the built form in views to the east from DC SAM and erode the sense of isolation. However, I do not consider that the view of an agricultural landscape towards the wooded slopes of East Covert would be diminished by the proposed development and this east view and the sense of isolation would not be diminished by a development on

a lower level and largely contained by existing development and established landscaping.

34. I conclude that the proposed development, given the distance, the angle of view and the extent of containment of the site with its surroundings in an extensive panoramic view, would have a neutral impact on the setting and significance of the DC SAM. The development of the site would not diminish a receptor's ability to understand and appreciate this heritage asset.
35. Turning to the views from the footpaths close to the site back towards DC SAM and towards BH and the BRHPG, the DC SAM cannot be seen from appeal site itself due to topography, the built form and landscaping. The view and experience of BH from the footpath close to the site is limited. A receptor would see the roof and gable chimneys of BH in a backdrop of densely planted woodland of East Covert. The obelisk is seen and a small part of Marl Hall. The BRHPG is not seen in this view. As the receptor traverses the footpath towards BH these features come into a clearer focus but by then the appeal development has been passed and the receptor is much closer to the A470. The receptor might be aware of a high status residence in the woods on the hill but would not be able to appreciate and experience its detail from this distance. However, the proposed development would not lessen the understating and appreciation of the setting and significance of BH and BRHPG as BH's roof and chimneys would be seen in isolation.
36. The Council say that open landscape has been encroached upon and that sufficient open space remains between assets to allow an appreciation of the separation between them and that in this historic landscape this contributes to the heritage significance of BH. It is also argued that development of the site would tip the balance in the relative composition of the view as the site is part of the landscape rather townscape. The Council refer to six assets but only three are identified in the reasons for refusal. Gloddaeth and BH were in the same ownership but seemingly there is limited evidence of any functional and historical link between all other assets and inter-visibility between these is also limited. As the development site is contained by built development on three sides and landscaping on the other side I do not view it as part of an open landscape. The contribution it makes to the composition of the view between high status heritage assets and the separation between them is limited.
37. The site is situated on the edge of the LOHI. The ASIDOHL2 report has sought to identify more precisely the boundaries of the LOHI. The LOHI includes a large area; Conwy, Llandudno and the coast, Deganwy and Llanrhos, but also includes some recent developments and allocated land in the LDP. The ASIDOHL2 considers the impact of the proposed development on individual HLCAs. The appeal site is located in the Creuddyn HLCA and borders Deganwy/Llandudno Junction, Conwy and Bryn Pydew HLCAs. The ASIDOHL2 concludes that with mitigation there would be a moderate visual impact on three HCLA's, Creuddyn, Conwy and Bryn Pydew, and slight impact on the Deganwy/Llandudno Junction HCLA. However, it considers that the development will have a negligible impact on the ability to understand and appreciate the affected HCLA's historical meaning and significance. The Council disagrees and considers that the development would impact on four of the twelve HLCAs which correspond to a low reduction of value of the Creuddyn and Conwy LOHI. However, for the reasons I have outlined above, the site appears as a logical expansion of the built-up area, it is not part of a secure agricultural holding and is contained by development on three sides. I therefore consider that given the small area of land on the periphery of the LOHI the loss to the historic landscape would not be significant.

38. Turning to the cumulative effects, there is criticism from statutory consultees and the Council that the development would tip the balance and exceed the critical point. However, there is no analysis of how this development would change the balance and harm the heritage asset and historic landscape. CADW refer to the possibility of a lower density development but that suggestion in my view undermines its case concerning the development's effect on the setting and significance of the heritage assets and cumulative impact. The SOCG confirms that there is no dispute between the main parties that the design and appearance of the development is acceptable.
39. In all, the evidence of the appellant and Council heritage witnesses should be given more weight than a statutory consultee response as their evidence was examined and tested at the Inquiry. I conclude that the proposed development would not conflict with LDP Strategic Policies CTH/1 and CTH/2. The proposal would not harm the setting and significance of the heritage assets identified or the historic landscape concerned.

#### *Agricultural land*

40. The Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) assessment undertaken by the appellant concludes that the agricultural quality of the land falls within subgrade 3a and that this qualifies as best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV). The appeal site comprises 4.55ha primarily within a single field unit. The Statement of Common Ground (SOCG) sets out an agreed position that the ALC of the appeal site comprises grade 3a BMV. An interested party challenges the findings of the assessment and indicates the presence of grade 2 agricultural land which was overlooked by the Welsh Government (WG) Department of Environment and Rural Affairs. Nevertheless, the relevant WG department confirms that the ALC assessment accords with its guidelines and that the grade 3a classification fairly reflects the agricultural land quality across the appeal site. In the light of the agreed position in the SOCG, and WG's stance on the matter, I am satisfied that the ALC assessment adequately reflects agricultural land quality across the appeal site as a whole.
41. LDP Policy DP/4 (2h) indicates that planning permission will not be granted where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on BMV agricultural land. Strategic Policy NTE/1 (e) seeks to support the wider economic and social needs of the Plan Area, and the Council will seek to regulate development so as to conserve and where possible enhance the Plan Area's natural environment, countryside and coastline. The policy indicates that this will be achieved, amongst other things, through sub-clause (e), by seeking to minimise the loss of Grade 2 and 3a agricultural land to new development, in particular, in the east of the Urban Development Strategy Area in line with Policy DP/6. Policy DP/6 requires development to accord with national guidance.
42. PPW 10 paragraphs 3.54 and 3.55 sets out that agricultural land of grades 1, 2 and 3a of the ALC is the best and most versatile, and should be conserved as a finite resource for the future, and when considering the search sequence in development plan policies and development management decisions considerable weight should be given to protecting such land from development, because of its special importance. Land in grades 1, 2 and 3a should only be developed if there is an overriding need for the development, and either previously developed land or land in lower agricultural grades is unavailable, or available lower grade land has an environmental value recognised by a landscape, wildlife, historic or archaeological designation which outweighs the agricultural considerations. If land in grades 1, 2 or 3a does need to be developed, and there is a choice between sites of different grades, development should be directed to land of the lowest grade. Technical Advice Note 6 Planning for Sustainable



Rural Communities (TAN 6) paragraph 6.2.2 recognises that once agricultural land is developed its return to BMV is seldom practicable.

43. In relation to the search sequence for development sites under the LDP the appeal site was identified in Background Paper 21 (BP21) 'Site Deliverability Assessment' 2008 but was removed on the basis that there was a large amount of committed sites in the area and was also in the green wedge at that time. In BP21, version 2011, the site was included on the contingency list in the Revised Deposit LDP in the event of deliverability issues with allocated sites. A revised BP21 in August 2012 indicated that the reduction in the contingency housing supply meant that the site was no longer required and that another site in the same settlement known as Woodlands was a preferred site and ranked higher and was allocated. Revised Background Paper 35 for the Conwy Deposit LDP removed the site from the contingency list as it was no longer required.
44. The appellant asserts that the site has been recognised as a potential housing site for many years and has been looked at against a full range of criteria. The appellant contends that the appeal site is regarded as a first ranked site and best available site (outside the settlement boundary sites of the LDP) to meet a clear need. The Council's Developer Guidance Note 1 (DGN 1) Speculative Housing Development Proposals December 2015 which was adopted by Cabinet places an emphasis on ranked sites by showing the next preferred site after allocated sites including the reserve contingency sites and the next best performing sites should they be required in future plan reviews. The Council suggests that these matters should be re-visited in the light of the WG letter dated 18 July 2018 (dis-application of paragraph 6.2 of TAN 1) and that BP21 documents did not distinguish the ALC within grade 3, whether the land was BMV or not.
45. The WG response on the application in 2016 indicated that it did not have detailed ALC information for the site and expected the ALC grading to be 3b. It advised that a survey be undertaken, the results of which revealed a 3a BMV grading. The WG response in 2017 recommended that the 3a ALC grading of the survey be accepted. The ALC information was not available for the LDP BP21 site selection process and site ranking in DGN 1. However, notwithstanding this the appeal site remains ranked as suitable in BP/21, and DGN 1 continues to direct developers towards the highest ranked sites.
46. The Council has not brought forward compelling evidence of other suitable and available previously developed land or land in lower agricultural grades to accommodate the development. Nothing has been presented of substantive difference to challenge the planning officer's conclusions on the issue as set out in the report to Planning Committee on 11/10/2017 which reinforces the same point.
47. The appellant's evidence from the Agricultural Impact Appraisal that the appeal site BMV land is not part of a wider and contiguous area of agricultural land of similar quality and does not form part of a secure agricultural unit has not been significantly challenged. I agree, taking into account the sensitivity of the loss of the lower grade BMV land in question together with, the scale of the loss below 5ha, and the magnitude of the effect, that the loss would amount to a minor adverse impact. The significant shortfall of housing land supply can be regarded as an overriding need for the development and given the foregoing matters, I do not regard the release of the appeal site would have an unacceptable adverse impact on BMV agricultural land in respect of Policy DP/4 (2h), and the overriding need to increase supply in the supporting text to Policy NTE/1 would constitute a reason to ensure the loss of BMV land is minimised.

48. I therefore consider that the proposed development would not conflict with LDP Policies DP/4 (2h) and NTE/1. The considerable weight given to protecting BMV land of the appeal site is tempered by the lack of conflict with the relevant and important policies of the LDP in relation to the issue of BMV agricultural land.
49. I conclude that the proposal would not result in the unacceptable loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.

*Housing land supply*

50. It is confirmed in the SOCG that the housing land supply position is 3.1 years as set out in the 2017 Joint Housing Land Availability Study (JHLAS). The 2018 JHLAS records the same position, equating to a shortfall of 1357 units. However, there is no dispute that the shortfall is generally increasing and has done so since 2012. This equates to 11 or 12 sites of the same size as the appeal site not being provided for in the LDP settlement boundaries, as required by Policy HOU/1.
51. Furthermore, the proposal would provide 33 affordable housing units where there is a significant social need. The appellant notes that the delivery of affordable homes over the last three years equates to 52 dwellings per annum against an assessed need of 199 dwellings per annum. The provision of 33 affordable homes on the appeal site against a backdrop of under-delivery is therefore a material consideration of significant weight in favour of the development.
52. WG letter dated 18 July 2018 (dis-application of paragraph 6.2 of TAN 1) announces a wide-ranging review into the delivery of housing through the planning system. This was in response to the current housing land supply position and to the under delivery of LDP housing requirements. The letter calls for evidence to address the issue but emphasises the principles that should apply and be addressed through the evidence submitted that planning decisions must be based on an up-to-date development plan, the plan-led approach to development management, housing requirements should be based on evidence and sites must be deliverable and monitoring arrangements must reinforce the plan-led approach.
53. The letter notes the concern that speculative applications for housing not allocated in the LDP is generating uncertainty for communities to the detriment of the plan-led system. The letter announced to dis-apply paragraph 6.2 of TAN 1 removing the paragraph which refers to attaching 'considerable' weight to the lack of a 5-year housing land supply as a material consideration in determining planning applications for housing. As a result of the dis-application of 6.2 of TAN 1, the letter indicates that it will be a matter for decision makers to determine the weight to be attached to the need to increase housing land supply where the local planning authority has a shortfall in its housing land.
54. The Council contends that less than considerable weight should now be applied to the issue of a shortfall in housing land supply and that this change elevates other issues such as BMV agricultural land and heritage issues to outweigh the issue of housing land supply in the overall balance.
55. However, the WG letter makes clear that it would be for the decision maker to determine the weight to the issue of shortfall of housing land supply. The weight to be attached is dependent on the magnitude of the shortfall, how long the shortfall will persist, what the local planning authority is doing to reduce it and how much will the development contribute to meeting the shortfall.

56. The need to provide a 5-year supply of housing land against the housing requirement is a key government policy as set out in paragraph 2.1 of TAN 1. The magnitude of the shortfall here is significant - 1357 units. The shortfall has been in place for several years and will not be rectified until the adoption of the LDP review which is an indicative date of 2021. The Council has produced DGN 1 to steer development outside the settlement boundary to sites that are best ranked as the next available site as identified by BP/21. The site was dropped as a contingency site because it was not numerically required at that time. It was regarded as the next best available site in the settlement for the LDP review process, however, the site is numerically required now and the LDP review is some way off. The Council seeks to down play the importance of DGN 1 and BP/21 but these are the only mechanisms which are in place to bring forward sites in the light of a significant shortfall. The proposal would contribute significantly towards making up the shortfall in a way that no allocated site within the boundary of the settlement or smaller windfall sites would achieve.
57. Taking these matters together I therefore attach significant weight to the need to increase housing land supply as a material planning consideration.
58. Interested parties are critical of the method of calculating housing land supply and that the dis-application of paragraph 6.2 of TAN 1 means that housing land supply should not be a material consideration. I have taken into account fully the representations on this matter but conclude that to adopt a different methodology to TAN 1 for calculating housing land supply would be unsound.

*Other matters*

59. Interested parties have raised a number of other issues in relation to this appeal and these are considered under broad headings below. A considerable number of letters had been received objecting to the development, I have considered these in the light of the main issues and other matters, and I have considered the statements made at the Inquiry by interested parties and the Assembly Member.

*Highway safety*

60. Concerns expressed relate to levels of traffic likely to be generated by the proposal, safety and capacity of the site access, the ability of surrounding roads to accommodate the levels of traffic, the increased risk to pedestrians and road users.
61. Highway concerns are not a disputed matter between the appellant and the Council as set out in the SOCG. The Highway Authority has not opposed the grant of planning permission subject to conditions and contributions to highway improvements as set out in the planning obligation. The traffic assessment has quantified that the maximum level of vehicle movements in any hour of the day is likely to be some 61 vehicles equating to 1 vehicle per minute at the site access, and much less on other parts of the local highway network. There is no technical evidence to suggest that there would be any difficulty in accommodating the development related traffic in relation to road capacity. The access has been designed in compliance with current design standards and a Road Safety Audit has supported the proposed access arrangements and road safety evidence indicates that this is not a material concern. It is common ground between the main parties that the site has safe and good access to non-car transport infrastructure including bus, and pedestrian and cycle routes.

*Public services – Education and Health*

62. Interested parties raise numerous concerns about access to GP services and that Ysgol Deganwy is at capacity and would not be able to cater for the demand for new places

from the development. However, the response on the planning application was the site fell within the catchment of Ysgol y Mynydd which has sufficient capacity for the demand generated from the development. I have no compelling evidence to suggest otherwise and the Council acknowledge that a financial contribution towards education places would not be warranted under The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 tests.

63. As regard the Health board response on the application it did not object to the development given that the number of houses proposed was within the predicated growth rate in the LDP. It did not request a financial contribution through a planning obligation and the Council has not opposed the development on this ground.

#### *Sustainable development*

64. Concerns have been expressed about the sustainability credentials of the proposed development. PPW 10 indicates that proposals should be prepared within the context of key planning principles and that the first stage is to assess strategic and spatial choices. Whilst the site adjoins the settlement boundary it is common ground between the main parties that the site is sustainable and that a search sequence reveals in BP/21 and DGN 1 that this is the next best available site in the settlement to deliver housing. Other facets of strategic and spatial choices in relation to design, promoting healthier places, impact on the welsh language, sustainable management of natural resources (drainage/bio-diveristy) and managing settlement form have been met by the submission of detailed studies in connection with this application and appeal. The proposal has been subject to detailed consideration of active and social places in relation to housing and transport and in relation to distinctive and natural places in relation to the historic environment and landscape.
65. In all, I have considered the duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 ("the WCFG Act"). In reaching this decision, I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WCFG Act and the Welsh Ministers well-being objectives set out as required by section 8 of the WCFG Act. I am satisfied that my decision accords with the Act's sustainable development principle through its consistency with the objectives concerning environmental well-being and supporting cohesive and attractive communities.

#### *Planning Obligation*

66. The appellant agrees to the libraries, open space, allotments and waste contributions of the Section 106 obligations. The Council has produced evidence submitted at document 20 to the Inquiry which demonstrates that no more than five separate planning obligations within the charging area have been collected in relation to these matters under Section 123 of The Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (CIL). The same document provides evidence in each case that there is a deficit in supply and that the proposed development would increase the demand and would worsen the deficit in line with LDP Policies DP/5, CFS/1, CFS/11 and Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Guidance LDP4. These planning obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development and fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. As a result, I give these obligations significant weight.
67. The highway contributions are contested and comprise three schemes. Scheme 1 (40K contribution) is footpath improvements at the top of Marl Lane by Albert Drive

and Tan y Gaer. Scheme 2 (20K contribution) is the construction of a pavement link and crossing point on Marl Drive to connect through to Nant y Glyn to improve the route to Ysgol Awel y Mynydd. Scheme 3 (25K contribution) is to provide improvements to the highway link between Marl Lane and the A470. In Scheme 2 the appellant is not required to pay the contribution if this amount is already paid by the Woodlands Marl Lane planning permission.

#### *Scheme 1*

68. The Council indicate that the proposed refuge point on the top of Marl Lane would not provide sufficient clearance between the outer body of a large vehicle and the refuge. It is contended that the swept path analysis demonstrates that vehicles would pass too close to pedestrians and cyclists. The appellant argues that the proposed arrangement is preferred, is safe, and there are alternatives such as the crossing point on Marl Lane near the bus stop. The appellant believes that the contribution is not needed to make the development acceptable because the Council's alternative provision duplicates the footways that are already available. However, the route on Pentwyn Road is an Integrated Network Map route approved by WG under the Active Travel Wales Act 2013. The proposal does not meet with the Active Travel Act 2013 design requirements. The appellant's contribution will go towards improving pedestrian and cycling movement in accordance with the Council's proposals for the Marl Lane/Pentwyn Road crossing and is necessary to make the development acceptable in relation to the CIL Regulations 122(2). I attach significant weight to this particular obligation.

#### *Scheme 2*

69. On my site visit I walked the route from the proposed development to the crossing point on Marl Drive to connect through to Nant y Glyn which leads to Ysgol Awel y Mynydd. I also walked the alternative route but either route requires pedestrians to cross Marl Drive. A contribution is already considered necessary for the same crossing from the Woodlands site development owned by the appellant. The planning obligation prevents a double payment being made in respect of these works. The contribution is necessary to make the development acceptable in relation to the CIL Regulations 122(2). I attach significant weight to this particular obligation.

#### *Scheme 3*

70. The appellant has modelled the Marl Lane/A470 junction as two separate junctions. The Council asserts that as the link road is only 38m in length that it should have been modelled as one junction. The link can only accommodate about 6 vehicles whereas the transport assessment has calculated queuing as 13 vehicles. The appellant argues that the interaction between the two junctions would be identical and the surveys indicate one occasion of a queue extending back from the Marl Lane roundabout and that this lasted no more than 5 minutes. A further queue survey was undertaken on 9 February 2018 at peak times and this revealed that in 54 periods where a queue length was recorded only 4 periods had a queue consisting of 1 or 2 vehicles. There was one occasion of a queue extending back to Marl Drive but this had cleared in 5 minutes. The Council alleges that the February survey was undertaken on half-term. The February survey was undertaken outside the school half term and is representative of typical road conditions.
71. The standard junction modelling reveals that no contribution for this obligation is necessary to constitute a reason for granting planning permission and the CIL

Regulations 122(2) are not met. I therefore attach little weight to this particular obligation.

### *Conditions*

72. I have considered the Council's suggested conditions and the appellant's response to them in the light of Circular WGC 016/2014 'The Use of Planning Conditions for Development Management'.
73. The main differences between the Council and the appellant relate to draft conditions 8 to 10, 12 to 14 in relation to highway matters. In relation to draft condition 8 the appellant notes that the information had already been provided, the Council indicates that the information had not addressed all matters. I therefore consider that the condition should stand. Minor changes were made to the wording of draft condition 9. I have revised condition 10 to reflect the appellant's concern. Compliance with design standards can be addressed by the re-wording of the condition without narrowly referring to technical highway standards. Condition 13 remains unaltered to ensure that the provision is acceptable in relation to the designation of the Integrated Network Map route in connection with the Active Travel Wales Act. Conditions 11, 12 and 14 are subject to minor re-wording.
74. Condition 1 imposes a stricter commencement period of 2 years given the pressing need to address the lack of a 5-year supply. The approved plans are listed to comply with Circular WGC 016/2014. Condition 3 is needed to ensure an appropriate programme of archaeological mitigation. Condition 4 is needed to ensure adequate provision of affordable housing as part of the development. Condition 5 is necessary to ensure provision of public open space and equipped areas within the site. Conditions 6 and 15 are needed in the interests of the visual appearance of the area. Condition 7 is needed to ensure adequate provision of foul and surface water drainage for the site to minimise the risk of surface water flooding. Conditions 8 to 14 are needed in the interests of highway safety.

### **Planning balance and overall conclusions**

75. I have identified conflict with LDP Policy HOU/1 in that the development is located outside the settlement boundary of the LDP.
76. I have concluded that the proposal would not harm the setting and significance of the heritage assets and the historic landscape, and that these assets would be preserved. This factor is a neutral point not a factor in favour or against the development.
77. I have identified that the proposed development would not conflict with LDP Policies DP/4 (2h) and NTE/1 in relation to the second issue, the loss of BMV agricultural land.
78. I have concluded that significant weight should be accorded to the issue of the shortfall of housing land supply and the contribution this development would make to increasing the supply of market and affordable housing.
79. The development is located on the fringe of the urban area whereby 85% of new housing will be located and is in general accord with LDP Policy DP/2. It relates well to the existing urban form. The proposed development is sustainable and accessible and accords with the strategic and spatial choices of PPW 10.
80. No other matters are raised of such weight as to materially alter my assessment of the balance of considerations in this case.
81. The planning balance is such that I allow the appeal.

*Iwan Lloyd*

INSPECTOR

Richborough Estates

## Schedule 1 – Conditions

- 1) The development shall begin not later than two years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:
  - Location Plan- BD/HP/LP1 Rev A- received 27/7/2016.
  - Beech Developments Housing Mix (Schedule) - received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type A3- BD/HP/A3 AP Rev A- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type A4- BD/HP/A4 AP- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type P3- BD/HP/P3 AP- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type B2 - BD/HP/B2 AP Rev A- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type D2H- BD/HP/D2H AP- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type DQ3- BD/HP/DQ3 AP Rev A- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type E4- BD/HP/E4 AP 01 -received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type E4- BD/HP/E4 AP 02- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type F2- BD/HP/F2 AP Rev A- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type F3- BD/HP/F3 AP Rev A- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type G3- BD/HP/G3 AP Rev A- received 27/7/2016.
  - House Type H3 - BD/HP/H3 AP- received 27/7/2016.
  - Single Garage- BD/HP/SG1 AP Rev A- received 27/7/2016.
  - External Works Timber Post & Railing and Wire Mesh - BD/HP/EXW3 – received 27/7/2016.
  - External Works Walls & Timber Railings - BD/HP/EXW4- received 27/7/2016.
  - External Works Screen Fence Details- BD/HP/EXW1- received 27/7/2016.
  - External Works Screen Fence Details- BD/HP/EXW2- received 27/7/2016.
  - Site Cross Sections- BD/HP/DS1 Rev B- amendment received 12/3/2017.
  - Swept Path Analysis (Refuse Vehicle) - SCP/16064/ATR01 Rev B- additional information received 10/4/2017.
  - Proposed Drainage- BD/HP/DR1 Rev A- amendment received 10/4/17.
  - Entrance Wall Detail- BD/HP/DS/02 Rev A- amendment received 10/4/2017.
  - Construction Plan Site Compound - BD/HP/SC/01 Rev B - amendment received 10/4/2017.
  - Construction Plan Site Set Up - BD/HP/SS/01 Rev B - amendment received 10/4/2017.
  - Regrade Layout - BD/HP/RG1 Rev B- amendment received 10/4/2017.
  - Proposed Ghost Island Right Turn Site Access Arrangement - SCP/16064/F01 Rev G - amendment received 31/7/2017.



- Planning Layout - BD/HP/PL 1 Rev E - amendment received 30/8/2017.
  - Proposed Turning Area Opposite Plots 100 to 102 - SCP/16064/ATR03 - additional information received 30/8/2017.
- 3) No development (including topsoil stripping, groundworks or site clearance) shall commence until a specification for a programme of archaeological work has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out and all archaeological work completed in accordance with the approved specification. A detailed report on the archaeological work, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority within twelve months of the completion of the archaeological work or of completion of the development, whichever is the sooner.
- 4) The development shall not begin until a scheme for the provision of affordable housing as part of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The affordable housing shall be provided in accordance with the approved scheme and shall meet the definition of affordable housing in Annex B of TAN 2 or any future guidance that replaces it. The scheme shall include:
- i. the numbers, type, tenure and location on the site of the affordable housing provision to be made which shall consist of not less than 30% of housing units;
  - ii. the timing of the construction of the affordable housing and its phasing in relation to the occupancy of the market housing;
  - iii. the arrangements for the transfer of the affordable housing to an affordable housing provider (or the management of the affordable housing (if no RSL involved));
  - iv. the arrangements to ensure that such provision is affordable for both first and subsequent occupiers of the affordable housing; and
  - v. the occupancy criteria to be used for determining the identity of occupiers of the affordable housing and the means by which such occupancy criteria shall be enforced.
- 5) The development shall not commence until a scheme for the provision of the public open space areas and equipped play space within the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall provide details of the specification, phasing of delivery and future management of the open space areas and the equipped play space. The public open space areas and equipped play space shall be completed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter retained in perpetuity and made available for public use.
- 6) Notwithstanding the details shown on the Landscaping Layout (BD/HP/LS1 Rev C), no dwellings hereby approved shall be constructed above ground level until a scheme of hard and soft landscaping has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include:
- i. indications of all existing trees (including spread and species) and hedgerows on the land, identify those to be retained and set out measures for their protection throughout the course of development;
  - ii. soft landscape works including: planting plans; written specifications (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants noting species, plant supply sizes and

- proposed numbers/densities where appropriate; an implementation programme (including phasing of work where relevant);
- iii. earthworks showing existing and proposed finished levels or contours;
- iv. means of enclosure and retaining structures;
- v. other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- vi. hard surfacing materials;

The landscaping works and all planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the buildings or the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner; and any trees or plants which within a period of 5 years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species.

- 7) None of the dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until the foul and surface water drainage systems relating to that dwelling have been completed, in accordance with a detailed drainage scheme that has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The drainage scheme include the proposed drainage layout (Proposed Drainage- BD/HP/DR1 Rev A) and the Drainage Strategy by Waterco Consultants (dated September 2017), together with details of the proposed surface water run-off/discharge rate and details of the future management, maintenance and adoption of the system for the lifetime of the development. The drainage system shall be managed and maintained thereafter in accordance with the agreed management and maintenance plan.
- 8) Notwithstanding the details submitted with the application, the development shall not begin until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. The statement shall provide for:
  - i. Travel Management Plan;
  - ii. proposals for the routing of delivery vehicles (for materials and plant) from origin to site;
  - iii. bilingual (Welsh above English) traffic management signs schedule and location plan.
  - iv. scheduling and timing of deliveries to the site;
  - v. location of construction compound and access to construction compound;
  - vi. location of sales office and associated visitor and staff parking;
  - vii. the parking of vehicles of site operatives and visitors;
  - viii. loading and unloading of plant and materials;
  - ix. storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development;
  - x. the erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays and facilities for public viewing, where appropriate;
  - xi. wheel washing facilities;
  - xii. the hours of construction work;

- xiii. measures to control noise from any generators, plant, machinery and equipment on site;
  - xiv. location of security lighting and other temporary lighting;
  - xv. measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction;
  - xvi. a scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from construction works.
- 9) The construction of dwellings above ground level shall not commence until the proposed access and visibility splays measuring 2.4m by 120m in each direction have been provided, in accordance with the approved plans and drawings. The visibility splays shall be provided as specified and be maintained free of any obstruction. The access and visibility splays shall thereafter be retained for the lifetime of the development. No dwelling hereby approved shall be constructed above ground level until the access has been completed up to at least binder course for a minimum distance of 25m from the public highway.
- 10) Notwithstanding drawing no. SCP/16064/F01 Rev G, no development shall commence until a scheme of highway measures including details of the pedestrian crossing and bus stop, road markings and gateway signage on Pentywyn Road, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the highway measures have been carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.
- 11) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be constructed until details of the following highway measures/works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority:
- i. A 2.5m wide spine footway/cycleway on one side of the adopted section of road up to turning head of plot 51/52 and linking to the open space areas;
  - ii. Detail design of traffic calming within the site;
  - iii. Detail design of uncontrolled pedestrian crossings and cycle crossing points within the site;
  - iv. Detail design of street lighting layout within the site;
  - v. Each private vehicle access shall have visibility splays of 2.4m by 2.4m onto a footway, or visibility splays of 2.4m by 23m onto a pavement designated for cycling;
  - vi. Detailed design of footpath/cyclepath layout within the open space area, in conjunction with the uncontrolled crossing of Marl Lane.
- No dwelling shall be occupied until the highway measures/works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 12) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until the base coat of the estate roads, turning heads, footways/cycleways, pedestrian link paths and street lighting leading to that dwelling have been provided, together with the car parking accommodation and turning areas for that dwelling, in accordance with the approved plans/drawings. The estate roads, footways, pedestrian link paths, street lighting, car parking accommodation and turning heads shall thereafter be retained in perpetuity.
- 13) No dwelling hereby permitted shall be occupied until a 3m wide footway/cycleway has been provided from the site access, along Pentywyn Road, to link through the proposed open space to the site boundary on Marl Lane, with

a service strip for street lighting of up to 1m, in accordance with a detailed scheme to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority.

- 14) The roadways, visibility splays, footways and pedestrian link paths shall be laid out and completed in accordance with the approved plans and drawings and the carriageway and footways shall be surfaced before the last dwelling hereby approved is occupied.
- 15) No dwellings hereby approved shall be constructed above ground level until details and/or samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwellings have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Richborough Estates

## APPEARANCES

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr Barrett of Counsel	Instructed by the Head of Law and Governance
He called	
Ms Stoten	Heritage - Pegasus Group
Mr Garner	Planning - Garner Town Planning Ltd
Mr Evans-Snarr	Council's Traffic and Transportation Engineer (Called for the round table discussion on the Section 106 and conditions)
Mr Watson	Principal Planning Officer (discussion on conditions)

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Manley QC of Counsel	Instructed by Mr Gilbert
He called	
Mr Elliott	Reading Agricultural Consultants
Mr Ives	Heritage Planning Ltd
Mr Gilbert	The Planning Consultancy
Mr D Roberts	SCP Transportation Planning (Called for the round table discussion on the Section 106 and conditions)

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Mr Edmondson	Welsh Historic Garden Trust Clwyd Branch
Mr Jones	On behalf of Ms Janet Finch Sanders AM
Cllr Shotter	County Councillor
Ms Duncalf	Resident
Ms Milward	Resident
Mr Rogers	Resident
Ms Parker	Resident
Dr Richards	Resident
Cllr Priestley	County Councillor
Mr Adams	Resident
Mr Owen	Resident
Mr E Roberts	Manager of Bodysgallen Hall

Ms Shaw	Resident
Ms Eastwood	Resident
Mr Taylor	Resident
Mr Thorne	Resident
Ms Jacovelli	Resident

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY

- 1 Council's notification letter and list of those notified
- 2 Statement of common ground
- 3 Statement by Ms Janet Finch Sanders AM read by Mr Jones
- 4 Statement by Mr Edmondson Welsh Historic Garden Trust
- 5 Photomontages
- 6 Statement by Mr Parry
- 7 Statement by Cllr Shotter
- 8 Statement by Ms Duncalf
- 9 Statement by Ms Milward
- 10 Statement by Mr Rogers
- 11 Statement by Ms Parker
- 12 Statement by Dr Richards
- 13 Statement by Cllr Priestley
- 14 Statement by Mr Owen
- 15 Statement by Mr E Roberts
- 16 Copy of email 21/09/2018 from Mr Clarke (Policy) to Mr Garner
- 17 Extract of Gwynedd Archaeological Assessment
- 18 Joint Housing Land Availability Study 2018
- 19 Statement by Ms Jacovelli
- 20 Information on pooled contributions
- 21 Extract of email from Road Safety Officer 12/09/2018
- 22 Council's copy of a User Manual for Autotrack
- 23 Council's extract of Design Guidance Active Travel Act 2013
- 24 Council's draft conditions and appellant's comments