Dear Mr Jones

LAND AND LAKES PROPOSALS AT HOLYHEAD
APPLICATION REF: 46C427K/TR/EIA/ECON

I write further to HOW Planning’s recent letters dated 22 October and 24 October 2013 in connection with the above planning application.

As part of these submissions, aspects of the very full and highly detailed Officers Report to the 2nd October Planning Committee have been highlighted which summarise and assess the substantial amount of information submitted by Land & Lakes in support of the scheme, in order to directly address the two grounds of objection the Committee identified namely:

- “over development” in the countryside; and
- detrimental impact on the AONB (Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty)

In addition to the information provided in these submissions, Land & Lakes is proposing revisions to the development at Kingsland which further improve the situation. The enclosed revised Kingsland Land Use Parameter Plan (Ref. PL1114.K.PP101 rev C) clearly shows the revised parameters for development proposed by Land & Lakes and the location of areas 1, 1A & 2 described below.

Prior to this revision, the majority of the area proposed by Land & Lakes for built development at Kingsland fell within the Holyhead settlement boundary as defined in the Stopped UDP. There were however two areas of the built development which were proposed on land outside of the settlement boundary.

Land & Lakes has given considerable consideration as to whether these areas can be omitted from the proposed developable area. It is possible to omit area 2 but not possible to omit area 1 (as referenced on the attached plan). However, to compensate for this, a larger area of land (referenced as area 1A), which is located within Holyhead’s settlement boundary, is proposed to be omitted. The omission of this land provides an increased buffer between the proposed built development and the open countryside to the west, from where there are views over the site (as shown in the submitted Landscape and Visual Assessment). This would serve to further reduce the landscape and visual
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impact of the Kingsland proposals upon the AONB. This added benefit would not be achieved by omitting area 1 as views into this area are over the golf course, which comprises higher land that naturally screens this part of the site.

In total, the developable area will be decreased by 1.034 hectares and to reflect this, the revised number of houses proposed at Kingsland will be reduced to a maximum of 320 (down from 360). This reduction in house numbers is the maximum reduction that Land & Lakes is able to offer and the revision to the proposals reduces the developed area across the entire scheme to approximately 16.5% of the application site.

A review of the submission materials has been conducted and it is confirmed that the reduction in the scale of development at Kingsland does not materially affect the findings of the EIA. Where differences between the information provided and the revised proposals have been identified, they are summarised below.

The assessment of traffic impacts (including the impact of traffic on air quality and noise) has been based on 360 units, meaning that the information presented represents a worst case scenario. Equally, the socioeconomics assessment includes an evaluation on the impact on demand for social and community services, which now also represents a worse case. The LVIA includes two photomontages from the west of the site. These photomontages show dwellings in areas that are now reserved for open space and as such they also represent a worse case assessment. These assessments need not be revised as the scale of development is reduced and any impacts would be lesser in extent or, at worst, remain the same.

The socioeconomics assessment includes an evaluation of the potential local spend from residents of the proposed dwellings and the impact this could have on the creation of local jobs. The reduction in dwelling numbers is anticipated to reduce the number of jobs created by local spending from 40 FTE to around 35 FTE jobs. This is an insignificant change, given the overwhelming job opportunities that the overall development will create, and would not affect any of the conclusions or mitigation measures set out in the ES.

In summary, the changes to the Kingsland scheme have been comprehensively assessed using a worst case scenario in the ES and the overall findings of the report remain valid.

**Revised Plans**

To reflect the revisions to the proposals described above, please find enclosed the following revised plans for substitution:

- Kingsland Land Use Parameter Plan (Ref. PL1114.K.PP101 rev C); and
- Kingsland Building Heights Parameter Plan (Ref. 232962 - 909 rev E).

**Overwhelming Support for the Development**

The support for the development has continued to grow since our last submission on 24 October. Whilst you will have continued to receive letters of support for the development, support has also grown in the social media channels as follows:
An **e-petition** in support of the proposals has currently been **signed by 797 signatures**. This e-petition can be found at:


The **facebook page** ‘Land and Lakes Anglesey’ was specifically created by Land & Lakes for this project and currently has **1,340 likes**. The facebook page can be found at:

https://www.facebook.com/landandlakesAnglesey

We request that the information provided in this letter is reflected in the Officers report to Planning Committee and that Members consider it carefully before debating the application at the forthcoming Committee meeting.

Yours sincerely

JON SUCKLEY
PARTNER
Direct Line: 0161 831 5878
Email: jon.suckley@howplanning.com

Enc.  Kingsland Land Use Parameter Plan (Ref. PL1114.K.PP101 rev C)
      Kingsland Building Heights Parameter Plan (Ref. 232962 - 909 rev E)

Cc:    David Pryce-Jones – IOACC
       Richard Sidi – Land & Lakes
       Gary Halman – HOW Planning