

Anglesey & Gwynedd Joint Local Joint Development Plan 2011-2026

Item Policy TA1 15 Housing and Local Service Centres – Page 158 & 159

Re - Cemaes - T35 Site Name:- to rear of Holyhead Road.

(N.B. the site is incorrectly named since the land concerned with the proposed Y35 Development comprises Field #'s 7700, 6592, & 6700 which can only be accessed via Ffordd y Felin which borders Field # 7700.

T35 involved in the later stages of its development an arbitrary extension of the Cemaes Village Boundary without notice, not prior consultation. The Llanbadrig Community Council were not advised, nor consulted about the Boundary Extension.

the original T35 proposal in Policy TA1 15 Housing and Local Service Centres – Page 158 & 159 involved 60 houses which did not have Planning Consent at that stage. The 60 houses in this specification were in Field #'s 6592, & 6700, and were in addition to the 2014 Grwp Cynefin/DU Construction/ACC Housing Department proposal for 12 off Affordable Houses in Field # 7700.

This made a grand total of 72 houses with a valuation of an estimated £250,000 each:-

= £15,000,000 plus 30% Overage Charge over 30 years in Field #'s 6592, & 6700,

plus

12 off Affordable Houses in Field # 7700 with a valuation of an estimated £150,000 each

= £1.250.000 plus 20% Overage Charge over 30 years.

For the newly proposed 15 Affordable Houses plus the Sewage Pumping Station the construction cost increase proportionately. viz:-

15 off Affordable Houses in Field # 7700 with a valuation of an estimated £150,000 each

= £2.500.000 plus 20% Overage Charge over 20 years - and additional £450,000.

I cannot see a Sewage Pumping Station plus power supplies costing less than an additional £250,000.

The additional contractual land sale terms and conditions regarding the overage charge make the Affordable House for too expensive and the 60 private houses uncompetitive.

It is believed the developer is under the impression that he can sell the Affordable Houses to Grwp Cynefin and that they will accept the additional overage charges as part of the Welsh Assembly Government subsidy of 58%

of the development value. Grwp Cynefin have to fund the balance of the capital sum required to buy the land and Affordable Houses from the Contractor by raising Mortgages.

The proposed Sewage Pumping Station

Re - Planning Application Ref:- 20C313A date17/08/16

Welsh Water through their Engineer, Mr Dewi Griffiths, have confirmed that the existing Cemaes Sewage Treatment System and Sewage Processing Plant at Wylfa Head is already overloaded. In heavy rainfall the sewers lose their manhole covers, or leak sewage on to the Little Beach Road.

The new Intermediate Holding Tank and Pumping Station behind "Glandon" on the Little Beach Road is already operating a full capacity & in an overload condition.

Welsh Water have confirmed that they have had to deal with the overload and the failure to pump the sewage to the Treatment Plant near Wylfa by regular visits by "Sludge Gulper Lorries" pump out the Intermediate Holding Tank behind "Glandon" house. Observations show that this operation has to be carried out regularly and frequently.

Welsh Water have confirmed that the developer proposing to build houses that would further overload the existing Sewage Plant System will have to find the financial capital resources to modify and improve the main Sewage Plant at Wylfa otherwise no further housing sewage arising can be accommodated. Welsh Water have neither the financial resources nor the intention to carry out the extensive Sewage Processing Plant Modifications at this stage, so no further housing developments in Cemaes Bay can be contemplated.

(Please refer to Mr Dewi Griffiths Welsh Water, [Tel:- 0800 085 3968](tel:08000853968))

Re - Planning Application Ref:- 20C313A date17 August 2016

This notice about the DU Construction Ltd Planning Application arrived by post this morning. It is dated 17 August 2016 but it was actually received by ACC Planning Department on 1 August 2016. The notice was also added to the ACC web listings of Planning Applications today 16 August 2016.

The arrival of this Planning Application creates serious disruption and confusion since the subject matter is directly concerned with the actual physical implementation of T35 in Field # 7700. The query arises which administrative procedure has precedence. Does the JLDP 2016-26 Inspectors Assessment of Submissions in the October meetings have priority.

Or - can this Planning Application # 20C313A go to the ACC Planning Committee and receive a Planning Consent in the presence of a active JLDP Assessment. This priority needs urgent clarification for the benefit of all parties.

It is my belief the DU Construction Ltd are concerned that we have a good case to stop T35 and consequently they wish to subvert the JLDP process instead of using it to promote their project.

It should be noted that Planning Application Ref:- 20C313A date 17 August 2016 is the 20th such Planning Application to have been submitted on Field # 7700. The latest previous Planning Application which was Refused was:-

Previous Letter and Report of Objection

Re-Planning Application on Field # 7700 - Dated 7 November 1990

This objection referred to Planning Application # 1 / 20 / C / 104:-

Re - Application for Proposed Residential Development of Land # 1 / 20 / C / 104:-

on O.S. 7700 adjacent to Myn y Cae, Ffordd y Felin Cemaes, (LL67 0LA).

The Planning Application was Refused.

Full details of the Objection submitted by Mr Thomas Conway, Mrs Barbara Conway, and others supporting neighbours were submitted in a formal complaint submitted to the ACC Chief Executive, Mr Richard Parry Jones, in a formal Complaint in a letter and Report dated 16 December 2014. It was entitled:-

Complaint

Re :- Anglesey County Council Housing Department, (hereinafter - ACC HD),

the Anglesey Rural Housing Enabler & Grwp Cynefin Housing Association

Re:- Action Prejudicial to the Planning Application Process

A complete copy of the cover letter quoted above dated 16 December 2014 and a bound copy of the report were submitted to the JLDP via Mr Bob Thomas for review by the Welsh Assembly Inspectors by the due closing date. Receipt was confirmed.

I would like to receive confirmation the both Inspectors have read this critical report.

The Consultative process used by Grwp Cynefin, Mrs Mary Sillitoe, ACC Rural Housing Enabler, ACC Housing Department have been disturbing, divisive, directed to achieve a predetermined objective, and excluded consideration of any viable, and suggested, alternative development sites to T35.

My previous statements on this item remains true and accurate.

The whole of the T35 proposals and the associated additional private development in Field #'s 6592, & 6700, are grossly unsound.

They include the totally discredited Conservative Government Policy of negative "Social Engineering" in which both builders and Local Authorities are encouraged to mix Social and Private Housing. The evidence associated with this policy shows that it is negative, it actually promotes anti social attitudes because people do not like it.

In the most recent local previous experiment with this policy in the Maes Capel Estate, Cemaes, 8 Affordable Houses were juxtaposed with a substantial private housing development on the Holyhead Road, Cemaes Bay, and directly opposite a row of existing long established private houses. The first thing to happen was that at least 4 out of the 8 existing private houses on the Holyhead Road were put on the market and 3 changed hands. The remaining house remains unsold and unsaleable because it is blighted by the minuscule Affordable Houses.

In addition the 8 Affordable Houses would not sell at £114,000 each. The builder is reported to have had to buy out the "Affordable House Conditions" and they were eventually sold at £127,000 each (Hearsay information which needs verification but believed to be substantially true).

This comment indicates the degree of serious unsoundness that exists in the existing presented JLDP, and the inadequate considerations given to the provision and location of Affordable Housing in Anglesey.

There are serious consequences associated with locating Affordable Housing are not consistent with the adjacent properties. This conclusion implies that Housing developments should be placed "Like with Like". In other words housing estates should be compatible with their neighbours. i.e. Houses should be "Zoned".

It is obvious when surveying the map of Cemaes Bay, and Amlwch, and other locations that the Affordable Housing Stock on in Anglesey is "Zoned" into compatible happy discrete areas. Cemaes Bay = Maes Cynfor, & Maes Padrig.

Hence the proposed 15 Affordable Houses proposed under **Planning Application Ref:- 20C313A date 17/08/16** should be located on land formerly owned by Anglesey County Council to the immediate West of the existing ACC Council House Estate (Maes Cynfor).

Maes Cynfor was originally designated to be extended to the west towards Wylfa. The land was effectively "Brownfield", not used, not cultivated, rank and otherwise unused.

The ACC proposed Affordable Housing Development was stopped arbitrarily by Mrs Thatcher by here politically biased decision to ban "Council House Building" full stop..

The formerly designated Council House Land was mistakenly sold to no useful purpose and remains unused and undeveloped. This land is directly adjacent to the SP334 "Manora" site and if added to that it could amount to some 7 acres. This land remains entirely suitable for a major Affordable Housing Development as a suitable alternative to the proposed T35.

This solution has already been specified in our JLDP Submission to the Inspectors, and featured in our Report of Complaint dated 16 December 2014. It was entitled:-

Complaint

**Re :- Anglesey County Council Housing Department, (hereinafter - ACC HD),
the Anglesey Rural Housing Enabler & Grwp Cynefin Housing Association**

Re:- Action Prejudicial to the Planning Application Process

=====

Action by:-

Grwp Cynefin, Mrs Mary Sillitoe, ACC Rural Housing Enabler, & Housing Department

Throughout the preliminary consultative proceedings by the above the above have caused some disquiet and concern by their totally blinkered approach to what is, in fact, a simple Housing Estate Siting Problem. They had a fixed unchanging objective and would not consider any viable alternatives.

The reasons for this are probably manifold. But the crux of the problem is that all the parties combined to one end.

In December 2013

Field # 7700 = 1.36 Acres was placed on the market by Auction by the Jones' family of Northop, formerly residents of the Mill on Ffordd y Felin. The auction was conducted by Jones Peckover of Four Mile Bridge, Menai Bridge. The Field # 7700 land is low grade grazing land. It was purchased by a Mr Gareth Taylor, Farmer and Building/ Haulage Contractor for the amazing sum of £40,000.

I/ We, have been unable to verify whether ACC, or GCC, or ACC/GCC JLDP prompted the Jones family into selling the land. However ACC/GCC did write to Mr Martin Parry of Cefn Helyg Farm to ask him if he was interested in selling his land viz:- Field #'s 6592, & 6700, & 6803. It transpired that the actual owner of the fields was Mr Martin Parry's Brother who subsequently placed all three fields on the auction market with Jones Peckover of Four Mile Bridge, Menai Bridge.(I have a copy of the Councils letter to Mr Parry.).

In the case of Field # 7700 the auction took place with a condition that an Overage Charge of 20 % would apply to the Developed Value of any subsequent development over 30 years.

In the case of Field #'s 6700, 6592 & 6803, the auction took place with a condition that an Overage Charge of 30 % would apply to the Developed Value of any subsequent development over 30 years.

The Overage Charge brings into question the viability of the financial case justifying the development. The additional charge makes the project uncompetitive and causes both rents and/or Purchase Prices excessively high and uncompetitive. The Overage Charge

also brings into question whether the Welsh Assembly Government will be requested to fund the Overage Charge in addition to the existing quoted 58% subsidy

-----*(ENDS).(PRO TEMP*

Dr Thomas Conway and Mrs Barbara Conway



2062 words.



**PWYSIG – FE ALLAI'R OHEBIAETH HON GAEL
EFFAITH AR EICH EIDDO.**

**IMPORTANT – THIS CORRESPONDENCE
COULD AFFECT YOUR PROPERTY.**

**GORCHYMYN CYNLLUNIO GWLAD A THREF
(GWEITHDREFN RHEOLI DATBLYGU) (CYMRU)
2012 RHYBUDD O DAN ERTHYGL 12(4) NEU
(5) O GAIS AM GANIATÂD CYNLLUNIO**

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING
(DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PROCEDURE)
(WALES) ORDER 2012 NOTICE UNDER
ARTICLE 12(4) OR (5) OF APPLICATION FOR
PLANNING PERMISSION**

Rhif y Cais: **20C313A**

Application Number: **20C313A**

Rhoddir rhybudd gan yr Awdurdod Cynllunio Lleol
fod **DU Construction Ltd** yn gwneud cais i
GYNGOR SIR YNYS MÔN am ganiatâd cynllunio i

The Local Planning Authority gives notice that **DU
Construction Ltd** is applying to the ISLE OF
ANGLESEY COUNTY COUNCIL for planning
permission to

**Cais llawn ar gyfer codi 15 o dai fforddiadwy, creu mynedfa newydd a ffordd mewnol ynghyd a
gosod gorsaf bwmpio carthffosiaeth ar dir oddiar / Full application for the erection of 15
affordable dwellings, construction of a new access and internal road together with the
installation of a sewerage pumping station on land off Ffordd y Felin, Cemaes**

Gall aelodau o'r cyhoedd archwilio copïau o'r:
cais; cynlluniau a dogfennau eraill a gyflwynwyd
gydag ef yn y Adran Rheoleiddio a Datblygu
Economaid, Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn

Members of the public may inspect copies of:
the application; the plans; and other documents
submitted with it at Regulatory and Economic
Development, Isle of Anglesey County Council

(Bydd Swyddog Gofal Cwsmer / Dyletswydd ar gael
o Ddydd Llun i Ddydd Gwener rhwng 10.30yb -
3.00yh os dymunwch drafod y mater ymhellach).

(A Customer Care / Duty Officer will be available
Monday to Friday between the hours of 10.30am -
3.00pm should you wish to discuss the matter
further).

**Dodir unrhyw sylwadau a wnaed ar ffeil sydd
ar gael yn gyhoeddus.** Dylai unrhyw un sy'n
dymuno cyflwyno gwybodaeth/tystiolaeth ynglŷn
a'r cais hwn ysgrifennu i'r Cyngor yn:

**Representations received will be placed on a
publicly available file.** Anyone who wishes to
submit submissions/evidence about this application
should write to the Council at:

Gwasanaeth Cynllunio a Gwarchod y Cyhoedd
Rheoleiddio a Datblygu Economaidd
Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn
Swyddfeydd y Cyngor
Llangefni
Ynys Môn LL77 7TW
(Oriau Agor – 9:00yb – 5:00yh)

Planning & Public Protection
Regulatory and Economic Development
Isle of Anglesey County Council
Council Offices
Llangefni
Anglesey LL77 7TW
(Opening Hours – 9:00am – 5:00pm)

Erbyn: 8/09/2016

By: 8/09/2016

*Mae'r Awdurdod yn caniatáu i'r cyhoedd siarad yn y
Pwyllgor Cynllunio ac mae manylion am hyn ar gael
drwy ffonio'r Gwasanaeth Cynllunio ar 01248
752528 neu ar ein gwefan. Er mai'r dyddiad cau ar
gyfer ceisiadau o'r fath yw hanner dydd ar y dydd
Gwener cyn y cyfarfod, anogir pobl sy'n dymuno
siarad gofrestru cyn gynted ag sy'n bosibl. O'r
herwydd, mae'r cyfrifoldeb arnoch chi i weld a fydd
cais penodol yn cael ei gyfeirio i Bwyllgor penodol
am benderfyniad. Gallwch wneud hynny drwy
gysylltu gyda'r Adran Gynllunio.*

*The Authority allows public speaking at the
Planning Committee, details of which are available
at the Planning Service on 01248 752428 or on our
website. Whilst the deadline for such requests is
12.00pm on the Friday before the relevant meeting
those wishing to speak at the committee meeting
are urged to register immediately. Thereafter the
onus is on you to find out whether a particular
application will be referred to a Committee for a
decision. You can do this by contacting the
Planning Department.*

Dewi Francis Jones
Rheolwr Datblygu Cynllunio
Ar ran Cyngor Sir Ynys Môn

Dewi Francis Jones
Planning Development Manager
On behalf of Isle of Anglesey County Council

Dyddiedig: 17/08/2016

Dated: 17/08/2016

Appendix 4
Candidate Site Assessment –Assessment Guidance Notes

Detailed Assessment Criteria								Commentary
1	Is there a risk of flooding?	No known risk of flooding and surface water flooding and possible link to surface water run off to adjoining watercourse	No known risk of flooding but limited risk of surface water flooding and possible to link surface water to adjoining watercourse	Site some distance from watercourse for surface water run off	Small proportion of site within area of known flood risk	Majority of site within area of known flood risk		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on EA Areas of Flood Risk map and TAN15 DAM Maps
2	Would development of the site lead to a loss of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1,2 and 3a)?		-	Not Agricultural Land	Proportion of the site is Best and Most Versatile Land	Over 50% of the site is Best and Most Versatile Land	Entire site is Best and Most Versatile Land	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on Agricultural Classification Map Consultation with WG Agricultural Division may be required
3	Is the site (or parts of the site) protected by landscape, ecological, geological or cultural designations?	-	No adverse impacts and opportunities to enhance designations	No adverse impacts on designations	Limited adverse impact on local designation	Significant adverse impact on local designation and /or limited adverse impact on international or national designation	Potential for a significant adverse impact on an international or national designation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on existing information held in development plans, NRW website Consultation with Biodiversity Units

Detailed Assessment Criteria								Commentary
4	Would development of the site lead to the loss of an important habitat, priority species (BAP), trees, hedgerows or lead to fragmentation of green corridor?	-	No loss of important habitat and adverse impacts on protected species. No fragmentation of green corridor. Opportunities for enhancement.	No loss of important habitat or fragmentation of green corridor. Presence of priority species unlikely.	Small proportion of the site contains important habitat. Priority species might be present. Fragmentation of green corridor could be mitigated	Large proportion of the site contains important habitat. Evidence of priority species on site. Fragmentation of green corridor could not be mitigated.	Entire site contains important habitat and is an important green corridor, mitigation Evidence of priority species on site.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult with Biodiversity Sections
5	Is the site within a groundwater or surface water protection area?	-	-	Site is not within a water protection area.	Site within a Groundwater Vulnerability Zone.	Site within Surface Water Safeguarded Zone and/ or Groundwater Source Protection Zone.	Site within a Surface Water Drinking Water Protection Area 'at risk' or 'probably at risk' and/or Groundwater Drinking Water Protected Area 'at risk' or 'probably at risk'.	
6	Does the site constitute Brownfield land?	Brownfield	Mixed site – part Brownfield	Greenfield within settlement	Greenfield adjoining settlement	Greenfield in the open countryside	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consult with Biodiversity Sections

Detailed Assessment Criteria								Commentary
7	Does the site have any value as an open space or recreational importance?	-	-	Site has no recreational or open space value	Impact upon locally important open space which has not been allocated in existing development plan framework	Impact upon allocation in existing development plan framework	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gwynedd – UDP (2009) Anglesey – Local Plan (1996), Stopped UDP (2005)
8	Does the current/previous use of the site suggest that there is a potential risk of contaminated land?	-	-	No contamination	Mild contamination that can be overcome	Major contamination that can only be overcome with major economic input	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with Contaminated Land Officer
9	Would development of the site present an opportunity to remove an eyesore?	A prominent eyesore which impacts upon the built environment and other possible regeneration proposals	Not prominent and does not seem to impact upon regeneration proposals	No eyesore	-	-	-	
10	LANDMAP Evaluation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visual and Sensory: Geological: Landscape Habitats: Historical: Cultural: 	Low	Moderate	-	High	Outstanding	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on NRW LANDMAP database
11	Is the site located within walking distance of a public transport terminal/ bus stop? (Please specify distance and whether it is	Under 400m	401m to 800m	-	801 to 1000m	1001 to 3000m	3001m+	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distance to nearest bus stop and/or train station

Detailed Assessment Criteria								Commentary
	steep/obstructed route)							<p>along footpaths and roads not as the crow flies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on guidelines from IHT
12	How far is the site from an existing recreational walking/cycling route?	Existing walking/ cycling route is present on site with the potential to incorporate with development	Existing walking/ cycling route adjacent to site	-	801m to 1000m	1001 to 3000m	3001m+	
13	Is the site accessible from a public highway?	Direct access to main road network with more than adequate visibility splays. PRow from site to community facilities	Very minor obstacles capable of being overcome	-	Major obstacles unlikely to be overcome	Site landlocked, evidence of a ransom strip, on a sharp corner poor highway network, some distance from main highway network, access through existing estate	-	Consult with Highways dept
14	Is the nearby highway system (including junctions) of sufficient quality to deal with potential development on the site?	-	-Highways system able to accommodate potential development	-	Substandard highway system which could be improved	Substandard highway system which could only be improved with major	-	Consult with Highways dept

Detailed Assessment Criteria								Commentary
						economic input		
15	Please state the distance to the nearest community service/facility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Post Office • Convenience Store • Primary or Secondary School • Supermarket • Surgery • Pharmacy • Dentist • Play Area • Other (please state) 	Under 200m (400m for schools)	201m to 400m (401m to 800m for schools)	401m to 800m (801m to 1200m for schools)	801m to 1000m(1201 to 1500m for schools)	1001m+ (1501m+ for schools)		Distances based upon standards by IHT
16	Please state the distance to the nearest utility connection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electricity • Gas • Water • Sewerage • Telecommunications 	100m or less	101m to 200m	201m to 300m	301m to 400m	401m+	-	
17	Do the topographical characteristics of the site present an obstacle to development?	Vast majority of site is level with no rocky outcrops	→	-	→	Site major obstacles to development including steep incline and rocky outcrops		
18	Would development on the site have an adverse impact upon important views/vistas?	-	-	No impact	Level of impact minor	Prominent site from a distance, impact upon Conservation Area and/or listed building	-	
19	Would development of the site have a detrimental impact on the			No impact	Minor negative	Major negative	-	

Detailed Assessment Criteria								Commentary
					impact	impact		
	character of the settlement? Would there be any adverse impact arising from potentially conflicting land uses?	-	-	No conflicting land uses	Conflicting land uses	Bad Neighbour land use	-	
20								
21	Is the site located within the built form of a settlement or does it constitute a minor extension to a settlement?	Whole site clearly within settlement	Site immediately adjoining settlement – minor extension with clear rounding off of settlement	Minor extension	Within 100m of settlement	Within 500m of settlement	Greater than 500m from settlement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measurements taken approximately from the centre of the site

Cemaes

Ref	Site Name	Area (ha)	
SP926	Land rear of Holyhead Rd	3.07	
			1) Flood risk
		2	2) Agricultural land
		0	3) Designations
		0	4) Biodiversity
		0	Area
		0	6) Brownfield / Greenfield
		-1	7) Recreation or Open Space
		0	8) Contaminated Land
		0	10) Remove Eyesore
		0	11) LANDMAP
		-1	12) Proximity to local transport
		2	13) Recreational Route
		0	14) Highways
		2	15) Topography
		2	16) Views and Vistas
		0	17) Settlement Character
		0	18) Loss of Employment Land
		0	19) Conflicting Land uses
		0	20) Relationship wth existing settlement
		1	Additional Comments

From: "Thomas Robert (Rh-CTGC)" <[REDACTED]>
Date: 30 March 2015 10:08:48 GMT+01:00
To: 'thomas.conway' <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: New e-mail addresses & T35 INFOMRMATION NEEDED

Dear Mr Conway

Sorry for the delay in responding I was in meetings all day Friday.

The site which ended up as T35 in the Deposit Plan was not subject to a formal submission onto the Candidate Site register by an individual. Rather due to problems with the other sites offered in the Cemaes area the Council through the JPPU identified this area as the most suitable land for development in the Cemaes area.

Enclosed is a copy of the Candidate site guidance Notes for the assessment of sites and the score for site SP926 which eventually ended up as T35 in the Deposit Plan.

Hope the above clarifies the position in relation to site T35.

Regards
Bob

Bob Thomas
Arweinydd Tim (Tai a Chymunedau)
Uned Polisi Cynllunio ar y Cyd / Joint Planning Policy Unit
Swyddfa Cyngor Dinas Bangor City Council Offices
Bangor
Gwynedd
LL57 1DT
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: thomas.conway <[REDACTED]> Sent: 26 March
2015 21:21 To: Thomas Robert (Rh-CTGC) Subject: New e-mail addresses & T35
INFOMRMATION NEEDED

Dear Bob

In case I have not already told you I have at lat managed to settle down with my new btinternet ISP account.

So my new e-mail addresses - which havae been tested to work are as follows;-

[REDACTED]

and

[REDACTED] a ver old ISP who only provides a very reliable e-mail service

Both work. Please record in your address book and use at your discretion. The BT ONE SEEMS TO BE OK

I am getting on with my submission. I briefed the Community Council on Monday evening and they were bemused by it all

I had 10 members of the public at the meeting so they may take things up and make their own submissions. Every little helps.

I need help with my submission about T35. I am gagged by being unable to challenge what the proposer has claimed for the sites

Please can you e-mail me a copy of the proposer's "REPRESENTATION FORM" SUBMISSION -asap

Intend to deposit my, and other submissions with your office on Monday 30/03/2015. Please could you acknowledge receipt of these at the time.

Thank you

Tom

----- Mae'r e-bost hwn ac unrhyw atodiad iddo yn gyfrinachol ac fe'i bwriedir ar gyfer y sawl a enwir arno yn unig. Gall gynnwys gwybodaeth freintiedig. Os yw wedi eich cyrraedd trwy gamgymeriad ni ellwch ei gopio, ei ddsbarthu na'i ddangos i unrhyw un arall a dylech gysylltu â'r anfonwr ar unwaith. Mae unrhyw gynnwys nad yw'n ymwneud â busnes swyddogol y corff sy'n anfon yr e-bost yn bersonol i'r awdur. ----- This email and any attachments are confidential and intended for the named recipient only. The content may contain privileged information. If it has reached you by mistake, you should not copy, distribute or show the content to anyone but should contact the sender at once. Any content that is not pertinent to the official business of the organisation is personal to the author. ----- Arbedwch bapur, ynni ac arian - Peidiwch argraffu'r neges yma oni bai ei bod yn hollol angenrheidiol. Save paper, energy and money - Do not print this message unless it is absolutely necessary.

CSR Guidance Notes.pdf ↪Copy of Cemaes.xls ↪