

---

## JOINT PLANNING POLICY COMMITTEE 17.02.12

---

### **Present:**

Councillors: Stephen Churchman, Trefor Edwards, O. P. Huws, Arwel Pierce, W. Gareth Roberts, John Wyn Williams, W. J. Chorlton, Lewis Davies, Kenneth P. Hughes and Eric Roberts

**Also present:** Aled Davies (Head of Regulatory Department, Gwynedd Council), Jim Woodcock (Head of Planning and Public Protection Services, Isle of Anglesey County Council), Gareth Jones (Environmental Services Manager, Gwynedd Council), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor, Gwynedd Council), Nia Haf Davies (Planning Policy Manager, Joint Planning Policy Unit), Bob Thomas (Team Leader, Joint Planning Policy Unit), Heledd Hughes (Team Leader, Joint Planning Policy Unit), Mike Evans (Senior Planning Officer, Joint Planning Policy Unit), Rhys Jones (Project Development Officer, Isle of Anglesey County Council), Llŷr B. Jones (Senior Manager - Economy and Community Department, Gwynedd Council).

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillors H. Eifion Jones, Clive McGregor and Hefin Thomas.

### **2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST**

No declarations of personal interest were received from any member present.

### **3. URGENT ITEMS**

No urgent matter was submitted.

### **4. MINUTES**

It was agreed that the minutes of the Joint Planning Policy Panel, held on 11 November 2011, were a true record.

It was agreed that the minutes of the Joint Planning Policy Committee, held on 17 June 2011, were a true record.

### **5. EMPLOYMENT LAND STUDY**

A presentation was received from URS, which was the company that had been appointed to undertake an Employment Land Study on behalf of both Councils. It was noted that the objectives were as follows:

- To inform the process of preparing the JUDP
- To provide an assessment of the local economic projections in the JUDP area

- To assess the current provision of employment land to meet the needs up to 2026 and identify gaps

Information was provided on the following:

- The methodology used
- The planning and economic context
- The results of the participation work
- The conclusions of the work of projecting needs for employment land over the JUDP period
- The results of the site assessment work
- Policy recommendations

Members referred to the following matters:

- i) The importance of acknowledging the cross-boundary relationship, i.e. with the Snowdonia National Park area, Powys, Ceredigion and Conwy. URS replied by noting that the study addressed the role and influence of places outside the JUDP area.
- ii) The importance of addressing issues relating to climate change.
- iii) That the conditions associated with European grant funding could sometimes restrict the availability of a site or unit for some employers. The importance of having an understanding of the needs of businesses early on in the process of planning for a site / unit, and designing for them, was noted.
- iv) Archaeological restrictions relating to the Parc Cybi site. The need to be flexible / innovative was noted. There was a need to start with parcels that were restriction-free.
- v) The need for a robust evidence base to assess the suitability of sites in order to be certain that key employment sites are not lost in the future.
- vi) Feasibility matters could mean that a mixed development (work and housing) would be needed on some sites.
- vii) The importance of promoting employment opportunities on smaller sites and making use of appropriate redundant buildings.
- viii) Opportunities that could arise for some parts of the area as a result of road and bridge improvements, e.g. south Meirionnydd and Penygroes.
- ix) The importance of looking at opportunities that could arise in connection with alternative technologies and the need to distribute opportunities across the area.
- x) It was asked why there was no reference to agriculture in the presentation as it was an important sector in this area. It was explained that the full report referred to this sector.

## **THE REPORT'S RECOMMENDATIONS WERE SUPPORTED**

### **6. DEVELOPING THE VISION, THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND THE OPTIONS FOR HOUSING GROWTH AND DISTRIBUTION**

The report of the Planning Policy Manager on the conclusions of the engagement work that had taken place between November 2011 and the end of January 2012 was submitted. The appendices to the report referred to the timetable for preparing the JUDP, presented a summary of the discussions held with stakeholders and the written comments received, and it also summarised the conclusions of the

Sustainability Appraisal thus far. Appendix 3 included an amended list of key matters, an amended vision and an amended list of strategic objectives.

The officer noted that the engagement work and Sustainability Appraisal identified the Alternative Housing Growth Option that would lead to the need to promote 511 housing units per annum, which was a medium growth level in comparison to the number of houses provided on average over the past decade and the numbers that the latest population and household projections (mid 2008) showed. It was noted that it was believed that this level was more realistic and offered sufficient flexibility to cope with different circumstances, e.g. success of initiatives to improve the local economy. It was emphasised that meeting this need would not involve promoting development on 'new' land only. For example, there would be a need to look at the number of housing units with extant planning permission, the contribution of initiatives to use vacant houses and other buildings in the long term, etc.

The officer noted that the engagement work and the Sustainability Appraisal had identified a Distribution Option that was similar to Option D3 (proportionate distribution). The difference was that the Main Settlements would receive slightly more development than what had been suggested under Option D3.

The following matters were raised by members:

- i) That the level of growth and distribution suggested was sensible and likely to be sustainable.
- ii) To consider amending KI 23 to read as follows: "The need to safeguard the **mineral** resources of the area and take full advantage of secondary aggregates whilst **assessing** maintaining the supply levels".
- iii) To consider amending KI 34 to read as follows: "To maintain the **positive** features that **contribute towards creating a unique** contrasting character in various parts of the area".

#### **RESOLVED TO SUPPORT:**

**a) THE SCHEDULE OF KEY MATTERS AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AS WELL AS THE VISION SEEN IN APPENDIX 3 OF THE REPORT, SUBJECT TO THE OBSERVATIONS IN 6ii AND 6iii ABOVE.**

**b) THE HOUSING GROWTH OPTION THAT WOULD PROVIDE 511 HOUSING UNITS PER ANNUM IN THE JLDP AREA.**

**c) THE FOLLOWING DISTRIBUTION OPTION:**

- TO FOCUS THE GREATEST DEVELOPMENTS AND REGENERATION ON THE MAIN SETTLEMENTS AND STRATEGIC SITES THERE.**
- TO SUPPORT DEVELOPMENT THAT REFLECTS THE SIZE, FUNCTIONS AND ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL CAPACITY OF THE NETWORK OF VARIOUS KEY SETTLEMENTS AND KEY VILLAGES.**
- TO SUPPORT MINOR DEVELOPMENT IN DEFINED MINOR VILLAGES AND IN THE COUNTRYSIDE, WHICH ASSIST TO MAINTAIN SERVICES AND FACILITIES FOR LOCAL COMMUNITIES.**