

Engineering works and use of land relating to the  
construction of the proposed A487 Caernarfon  
Bontnewydd Bypass and existing minerals  
permission

## **Pre-Application Consultation Report**

for

**JONES BROS BALFOUR BEATTY**

December 2016

3030



## Engineering works and use of land relating to the construction of the proposed A487 Caernarfon Bontnewydd Bypass and existing minerals permission

### Pre-Application Consultation Report

for

**Jones BROS BALFOUR BEATTY**

December 2016

3030

©Copyright. This report and figures remain the copyright of Richards, Moorehead & Laing Ltd.

QUALITY ASSURANCE PROCEDURES: QP4

Prepared by:	Andrew Sumner	Date:	December 2016
Checked by:	Shan Wyn Jones	Date:	December 2016
Approved by:	David Richards	Date:	December 2016

Visit RML's web site at [www.rmlconsult.com](http://www.rmlconsult.com) for the latest information on our services and staff.

## 1 THE PROPOSAL

### 1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 This Pre-Application Consultation Report (PAC Report), relates to one of two separate planning applications to be made on behalf of the Jones Bros – Balfour Beatty Joint Venture (JBBB). Both applications are associated with the proposed construction of the A487 Caernarfon to Bontnewydd Bypass.

1.1.2 This PAC report relates to a planning application, for continued mineral working and for a temporary construction compound at the Caernarfon Brickworks Quarry, has been prepared on behalf of JBBB by Richards, Moorehead & Laing Ltd and will be submitted to the North Wales Joint Minerals Planning Authority (NWJMPA). A separate PAC report is presented for the second planning application.

1.1.3 Since 1st August 2016 planning applications for 'Major' development must undergo a 'Pre-Application Consultation'(PAC) in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) (Amendment) Order 2016 (the PAC Regulations). The statutory requirements of the process are set out in Section 4 of this document.

This PAC report seeks to ensure compliance with the 2016 Order, with reference to paragraph 2F, which requires that a pre- application consultation report which gives particulars of how section 61Z of the 1990 Act has been complied with; any responses received from relevant consultees, and the account taken of responses.

### 1.2 Legislative requirements

#### *Legislative context*

1.2.1 These new pre-application consultation procedures have only been in force since August 2016. To ensure that the process, and the reasons for implementing them, is understood, this PAC document includes a lot of information that would not be required once the procedures become more familiar to all concerned.

#### *Requirement to carry out pre-application consultation*

1.2.2 Pre-Application Consultation is required for all 'Major Development', and for the purposes of the 1990 Act (Wales: requirement to carry out pre-application consultation), the proposed scheme is a major development, which means the area exceeds 1 hectare.

#### *Publicity before applying for planning permission*

1.2.3 **Notices:** The Act requires the applicant to publicise the proposed application by giving requisite notice, which includes:

RICHARDS, MOOREHEAD & LAING LTD  
55 WELL STREET, RUTHIN, DENBIGHSHIRE LL15 1AF  
Tel +44(0)1824 704366, Fax +44(0)1824 705450  
email: [rml@rmlconsult.com](mailto:rml@rmlconsult.com) web: [www.rmlconsult.com](http://www.rmlconsult.com)  
Registered in England No. 1848683 VAT Reg. No. 401 4243 13



- in writing to any owner or occupier of any land adjoining the land to which the proposed application relates; and
- by site display in at least one place on or near the land to which the proposed application relates for not less than 28 days. If the notice is removed, obscured or defaced before 28 days has elapsed, the applicant will be treated as having complied with the requirements of the relevant paragraph if they have taken reasonable steps to protect the notice and, if need be, replace it;

*Who is to be consulted?*

1.2.4 The Act classifies those who are to be consulted:

- Community consultees
- Specialist consultees
- Adjacent landowners

*How long do consultees have to respond?*

1.2.5 Where an applicant is required to consult a community or specialist consultee, the applicant must give them requisite notice in writing of the proposed application, and have given them time to respond before an application is submitted. In this case the period is 28 days.

*Information about the development*

1.2.6 The applicant must also make information about the proposed development available for inspection at a location in the vicinity of the proposed development for not less than 28 days beginning with the day on which the notices are published. For each of the documents referred to in article 2C(1)(b) or provide a link to a website on which those documents can be found.

- Documents and particulars or evidence that would be required for a subsequent application, in the same or substantially the same form, to be a valid application (except certificates);
- A plan identifying the land to which the proposed application relates;
- Any other plans, drawings and information necessary to describe the development. The plans need to be drawn to an identified scale and must show the direction of north.
- The design and access statement, if one is required;

### *Pre-Application Consultation Report*

- 1.2.7 Where an applicant has been required to carry out pre-application consultation the subsequent application for planning permission must be accompanied by a Pre-Application Consultation Report which sets out how the applicant has complied with the requirement to consult; what responses were received from any consulted person or organisation; and how responses have been taken into account in the planning application. The Applicant has flexibility to determine the most effective way to present the pre-application community consultation report providing all points in the following paragraphs are addressed.
- 1.2.8 The pre-application consultation report must include:
1. A copy of the notice that has been displayed and delivered to consultees;
  2. A declaration that the notice was properly displayed;
  3. The addresses of adjacent landowners, specialist consultees and community consultees\*\*;
  4. A copy of the notice given to the adjacent landowners;
  5. Copies of all notices given to community consultees and specialist consultees;
  6. A summary of all matters raised by adjacent landowners and consultees;
  7. Confirmation of whether the issues raised have been addressed, and if so, how;
  8. Copies of all responses received from specialist consultees with an explanation of the account taken of each response.

\*\* Under the Data Protection Act 1998, the addresses and other contact information of private individuals must be redacted in the Consultation Report before it is submitted. If developers undertake publicity or consultation that exceeds the minimum statutory requirements, they are encouraged to report the outcome of this pre-application engagement in the pre-application consultation report.

### *Duties placed on specialist consultees to respond to pre-application consultation*

- 1.2.9 A specialist consultee, consulted in accordance with 1990 Act, must provide a substantive response within 28 days beginning with the day on which the notice is given. A different period may be agreed in writing between the specialist consultee and the applicant.
- 1.2.10 A substantive response is set out in the Act as, stating that:
- (a) the specialist consultee has no comment to make;

- (b) or has no objection to the proposed development and refers the applicant to current standing advice by the specialist consultee on the subject of the consultation;
- (c) or advises the applicant of any concerns identified in relation to the proposed development and how those concerns can be addressed;
- (d) or advises the applicant that the specialist consultee has concerns and that it would object to an application for planning permission made in the same or substantially the same terms and sets out the reasons for those objections.

### 1.3 The applicant

- 1.3.1 The Applicant is Jones Bros Civil Engineering Ltd, of Ruthin. The application is submitted on behalf of the Jones Bros Balfour Beatty Joint Venture (JBBS), which is the contracting body that have successfully tendered to design and build the A487 Caernarfon and Bontnewydd bypass, on the behalf of Welsh Government.
- 1.3.2 The Agent responsible for submitting the Planning Application, on the behalf of Jones Bros Civil Engineering Ltd, is Richards Moorehead & Laing Ltd.

### 1.4 Project description

- 1.4.1 The following description is taken from documents publicly available during the PAC consultation.
- 1.4.2 The site lies immediately to the south of the town of Caernarfon and consists of an existing clay quarry, large areas of hard surfaced yard on both sides of the River Seiont and an area of pasture to the east. Existing road access to the quarry is from Pont Seiont roundabout and Seiont Mill Road.
- 1.4.3 The JBBS joint venture, is the contractor likely to be responsible for construction of the proposed A487 Caernarfon to Bontnewydd Bypass. To assist in the local sourcing of construction materials for the bypass they propose to resume extraction of minerals in the quarry under the existing minerals planning permission and to modify the agreed restoration scheme to improve safety and slope stability. 'The scheme' will also include engineering works to an existing quarry haul road on south eastern side of quarry void and a new haul road on the north and east side, for use in bypass construction.
- 1.4.4 A temporary, existing small compound associated with the scheme, located on the former brickworks yard at the quarry, will be expanded to provide additional staff offices and welfare facilities, car parking, a plant maintenance shed and bunded fuel store for the duration of the bypass construction contract.

- 1.4.5 A detailed description is included in Chapter 4 of the Environmental Statement which was available for examination for the full duration of the consultation.
- 1.4.6 Some of the specialist consultees have been consulted on one or more occasions previously and the proposals, having been developed and modified as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment.



## 2 OUR APPROACH TO CONSULTATION

### 2.1 Site notice and exhibition

- 2.1.1 The PAC regulations require the Applicant to make a declaration stating that a site notice was displayed, in accordance with the statutory requirements, i.e. in at least one place on, or near the development site for no less than 28 days. The Site Notice is included in Appendix 9.1 (A&B). The notices were displayed at the locations listed in Table 1 and shown in Figure 3030/PAC.01, on the 14 October 2016. Confirmation that all site notices were displayed in accordance with the location plan is also included in Appendix 9.

**Table 1: locations used to display notices**

Location	
1	Junction of A4085 Constantine Road and Eryri Road
2	Near the Junction of A4085 Constantine Road and Bryn Eilian
3	On the A4085 Waenfawr Road approximately 150 metres south east of the bridge over the River Seiont
4	Approximately 250m south west of Tai Glangwna (Caeathro) along an unclassified Road leading to Penybryn Lane
5	Located on the same unclassified road as (4), close to the 30 speed limit signs where a public right of way crosses.
6	Pen y Bryn Lane approximately midway along
7	Close to the entrance to the park on Seiont Mill Road
8	At the gates to the Seiont Mill Quarry

- 2.1.2 Notifications, inviting a response to the consultation were submitted to the relevant specialist and community consultees (Article 4, PAC Regulations) consultees. The majority of adjoining landowners and occupiers were informed by hand-delivered invitation letters, which included a total of 150 address points. As one adjoining landowner (to the south of the site) did not have a local address contact, this included a specific postal delivery. Samples of the letters are included in Appendix 9.2 and 9.3.
- 2.1.3 Under the Data Protection Act 1998, the addresses and other contact information of private individuals must be redacted in the Consultation Report before it is submitted.



2.1.4 The letters invited recipients to completed a questionnaire after examining the documents, either:

- A. exhibited, during their normal opening hours, at:
  - Public library, Pavilion Hill, Caernarfon
  - On site, at: Seiont Quarry Office, Seiont Mill Road, Caernarfon
- B. electronic versions of the pre-application consultation documents, available for download.

## 2.2 Publicity for the pre-application consultation

2.2.1 Table 2 sets out the steps taken in chronological order.

### *Public notices*

2.2.2 In accordance with the legislation, public site notices (bilingual Welsh/English) were placed in suitably accessible and visually prominent locations around the site, on/near public footpaths and roads likely to be used by adjoining occupiers/landowners. The notices, printed at A4 size and laminated to protect against the weather, were placed on the same day as the commencement date of the consultation period. The notices were inspected regularly during the consultation period with the intention of replacing any that were removed or defaced. No replacement notices were required. The locations of the notices are shown in Figure 3030.PAC.0.1.

### *Letters to Adjoining Landowners*

2.2.3 In accordance with the regulations letters (bilingual Welsh/English) were delivered by hand to the adjoining occupiers/landowners (with the exception of one landowners – see para.2.2.2 above). Taken literally, this would mean that very few neighbours would receive these letters. The decision was made to deliver letters to occupiers/ landowners and to other properties considered to lie in close proximity to the site of the proposed development. The names and addresses used are provided in this document in accordance with the requirements of the Data Protection Act.

### *Community Consultees*

2.2.4 Letters were emailed to the two relevant Community Councils relating to the planning application site (Bontnewydd and Waunfawr) and also to the Seiont Ward, which lies in close proximity to the west of the site. The relevant County Councillors were also consulted. No written responses were received from the Community Consultees, although Waunfawr Community Council made reference to concerns raised and submitted through the PAC consultation by one of the Adjacent property owners.

*Publicity using the media*

- 2.2.5 Jones Bros issued a press release to the media and local newspapers published the article setting out the scheme and explaining the consultation process.

**2.3 Locations where the public could view the plans and supporting information**

- 2.3.1 Consultation drafts of all documents for the proposed planning application were made available to consultees. The documents included a draft of:

- The relevant Planning Application form,
- Planning Application Drawings
- Design and Access Statement
- Sustainability Statement
- Environmental Statement

*Availability to download as pdf files*

- 2.3.2 These documents were made available for all consultees to download from a website

[rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.htm](http://rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.htm)

All documents were available throughout the consultation period and remain available to view on the website. The weblink was provided in the site notices, invitation letters, consultation emails and the press release. The weblink was checked daily.

*Printed copies*

- 2.3.3 Two full sets of the documents were printed and bound and deposited in the locations stated in paragraph 1.2.4. The two locations, and relevant opening hours for these buildings included in the site notices, invitation letters to consultees. These sets were routinely inspected to ensure that nothing was missing or defaced. At the end of the period the library set was removed, but the Seiont site office copy remains available to view by appointment, if required.

**2.4 Specialist consultees**

- 2.4.1 PAC Consultation Notices were issued to the following Specialist Consultees by email:

- Cadw Historic Environment Service
- Natural Resources Wales (NRW)
- Gwynedd County Council Highways Department
- Welsh Government Network Management Division, Transport, Department for Economy, Science and Transport
- Welsh Water

**Table 2: the steps in the consultation in chronological order**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Step</b>
<b>07/10/16</b>	Notices issued to specialist Consultees by email
<b>14/10/16</b>	Notice issued to neighbouring landowners by hand-delivered letters
<b>10/10/16</b>	Notice issued to Community Consultees by email
<b>14/10/16</b>	Public notices erected
<b>14/10/16</b>	Documents available in the Public Library & Seiont Quarry Offices
<b>02/11/16</b>	Reminder emails sent to the Specialist Consultees
<b>02/11/16</b>	Reminder emails sent to the Community Consultees
<b>30/11/16</b>	Public notices checked for legibility
<b>30/11/16</b>	Deposit documents checked for completeness
<b>07/11/16</b>	Request for extension of response period from Cadw
<b>08/11/16</b>	Extension of response period confirmed
<b>08/11/16</b>	Waunfawr Community Council request for site visit
<b>09/11/16</b>	Extension of time confirmed
<b>07/11/16</b>	Completion date for specialist Consultees
<b>14/11/16</b>	Completion date for Adjacent Landowner/Occupiers
<b>15/11/16</b>	Consultation web based questionnaire closed.
<b>04/11/16</b>	Response received from Welsh Government
<b>04/11/16</b>	Response received from Gwynedd Council Highways
<b>02/11/16</b>	Response received from Welsh Water
<b>07/11/16</b>	Response received from NRW
<b>09/11/16</b>	Response received from Cadw

## 2.5 Process for dealing with responses

- 2.5.1 The format of the web based questionnaire automatically closed at the end of the PAC consultation deadline date.

### *Collation of responses*

- 2.5.2 All responses received were collated during the preparation of this report. Some consultees responded to both applications in a single response. Therefore, during the consideration of responses those comments that could not apply were removed from the respective PAC report.
- 2.5.3 The PAC regulations state that specialist consultees must provide a ‘*substantive response*’ (within 28 days of the notification), which includes one of the following;

- (a) *the specialist consultee has no comment to make;*
- (b) *has no objection to the proposed development and refers the applicant to current standing advice by the specialist consultee on the subject of the consultation;*
- (c) *advises the applicant of any concerns identified in relation to the proposed development and how those concerns can be addressed;*
- (d) *advises the applicant that the specialist consultee has concerns and that it would object to an application for planning permission made in the same or substantially the same terms and sets out the reasons for those objections.*

A schedule of the full set of applicable comments considered by the Applicant and the response and actions taken is set out later in this report.

- 2.5.4 This report sets out the responses received and corresponding actions taken. Amendments to the planning application documents were made, as necessary to provide further information, clarification or to remove any ambiguity that had emerged.

## 2.6 Evaluating the consultation process

- 2.6.1 The method of consultation has proved effective with responses from all specialist consultees; a meeting at the Seiont Offices with members of the Waufawr community council and, letters from some of the neighbouring properties.

**Adjacent landowner consultees** responded within the given period.

**Specialist Consultees:** a request for an extension of time was made by Cadw and permission was given. Natural Resources Wales did not request an extension of time, but returned their response sometime after the deadline. With the exception of the response from Welsh Water, the majority of the 'substantive responses' did not object and additional guidance provided.

**Community Consultees:** In the case of Waunfawr Community Council, a site meeting was held in November, on the request of the community councillors.

- 2.6.2 The use of a web-based questionnaire was considered effective, and only one landowner consultee chose to send us a hard copy of the questionnaire. There were no adverse comments from consultees in respect of the web-based survey.
- 2.6.3 One of the adjoining landowner consultees considered that the consultation was too late in the process and should have occurred earlier.
- 2.6.4 It was clear that with two applications being publicised together, one for temporary proposals only, and a second for a full scheme including temporary and permanent proposals, that consultees chose to provide a single response to both.
- 2.6.5 The PAC process is a worthy one with sound objectives, but it was clear from the responses received that most consultees, including some of the specialist consultees, did not read the relevant parts of the documents fully. However, if all the draft planning application documents are prepared fully in accordance with guidelines, regulations, best practice advice, and the requests of their own organisations, the consultees are faced by a great deal of reading matter. If PAC is to play a useful role in the development of future planning applications, it is to be hoped that the specialist consultees will make use of the opportunity to give useful and well-informed advice and to dedicate staff time to full examination of the relevant documents.
- 2.6.6 The responses received have been useful and informative to the Applicant and will help to refine the applications.

## 2.7 How issues raised have been addressed by the developer

- 2.7.1 The responses received have been useful and informative to the Applicant and will help to refine the applications in several ways, by identifying:
  1. ambiguities or a lack of clarity in wording;
  2. aspects of the development proposal that needed further development or refinement;
  3. aspects of the documents that needed enhancement;

#### 4. matters of controversy.

### 2.8 Consultations in excess of the minimum requirements of PAC

- 2.8.1 During development of this planning application consultations have been undertaken with all of the specialist consultees. The specialist consultees have been invited to comment at previously held meetings, through correspondence and through statutory requirements such as EIA Screening and Scoping.
- 2.8.2 The PAC process requires that the Applicant should consult adjacent landowners/occupiers. As these were considered to be very limited in this particular case, with no more than 10, it was decided that all landowners and residents 'overlooking' the proposed development should be consulted. This meant that instead of 10 consultation letters, over 149 were delivered by hand to adjoining properties.



## 4 ISSUES RAISED AND HOW THESE HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED BY THE DEVELOPER

### 4.1 Specialist consultees

Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (c):</b> response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
Please note that our comments are without prejudice to any comments we may wish to make when consulted on any subsequent planning application or permit (either at pre-application or application stage) for the proposed development. At that time, there may be new information available which we will need to take into account in making a formal response.	NRW have been consulted on a number of occasions including at a meeting, in response to a formal EIA 'Scoping' opinion submission (see <a href="https://diogel.cyngor.gwynedd.gov.uk/swiftlg/imagetemp/46689-326584.11.15.pdf">https://diogel.cyngor.gwynedd.gov.uk/swiftlg/imagetemp/46689-326584.11.15.pdf</a> ) to the local the planning authority, and then the PAC process. See below. Nor have comments on the site been proactively offered by the NRW to assist the Applicant in developing a scheme of mitigation, despite their staff making visits to the site, obtaining survey data from others and apparently, having made observations of protected species (Badger) on the site.	No action
The concerns we have identified are substantive matters for the applicant, either owing to scale or because the applicant has not offered solutions. We consider the proposal could be acceptable, either by having more information to finalise an assessment or by modification to make it acceptable. It is appropriate to flag that we have significant concerns and that we would object if they are not addressed.	The most appropriate time to raise matters is at the EIA Scoping stage. This is to ensure that all relevant and necessary details are highlighted as early as possible with any proposed development and limits any additional expenses/costs incurred at a later stage. Hence, any additional requests for information, or raising new matters should be avoided, unless this is brought about as a consequence of any significant change in circumstances.  In addition to the Screening and Scoping stages, the NRW have been consulted on a number of occasions. This process started with a meeting with them in their offices in Parc Menai on the 25 <sup>th</sup> September 2015. Notes of the meeting are included in the Appendices, along with other correspondence with NRW.	Refer to various previous consultations and include written records in Appendix 9.4 to this PAC report.
An Environmental Permit will be required to deposit waste materials within the quarry. There are standard rules permits available for such operations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standard Rules SR2010No9 Use of waste for reclamation, restoration or improvement of land (up to 50,000 tonnes)</li> <li>Standard Rules SR2010No10 Use of waste for reclamation, restoration or improvement of land (up to 100,000 tonnes)</li> </ul> If the conditions of the standard rules permit cannot be met, such as the tonnages required, a bespoke permit will need to be applied for.  Such Environmental Permits for deposit of waste to land for recovery will require a Waste Recovery Plan to be submitted and approved by Natural Resources Wales. The Waste Recovery Plan should be submitted for approval prior to submitting a permit application. The Waste Recovery Plan should answer all the questions set out in Regulatory Guidance Note 13 (RGN) 'Permanent deposit of waste on land'. Further information is available on the Natural Resources Wales website. It is recommended that the applicant contacts the local Waste Regulation team for pre-application discussions prior to submitting an application for an Environmental Permit.	A bespoke permit is currently being applied for with the draft Waste Recovery Plan currently (November 2016) with NRW for review.  The ES makes reference to the need for Environmental permits e.g. paragraph 15.7.20 to 15.7.22.-  No mention was made to the 20 October 2016 changes to the Waste Recovery requirements.  Contact made with local 'Waste Regulation' team.	The reference to a bespoke permit has been re-affirmed in the documents. We await a response from NRW regarding the Waste Recovery Plan.  Reference added to the ES Chapter 2 paragraph 2.4.10, and in Chapter 15 paragraph 15.7.20.

Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (c):</b> response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
<p>With regard to the management of the site during the active working period for the bypass works the following comments are made.</p> <p>All fuels, oils and chemicals must be stored in a secure bunded facility. The site must also have a spill plan and a suitable spill kit available. The Control of Pollution (Oil Storage Wales) Regulations 2016 need to be adhered to at all times. All material storage and working areas must have appropriate containment to ensure that any run off is contained and managed to ensure that there is no impact on any watercourse. Drainage from haul roads must not result in a sediment laden discharge to any watercourse. The lagoon has historically formed part of a treatment facility for run off from the quarry prior to discharge to the Afon Seiont. There continues to be a permit for the active discharge from the quarry reference CG0092101. A new or revised permit will be required prior to the discharge formally being brought back into operation.</p> <p>Any discharge will require appropriate monitoring. Any incident that may result in any environmental impact or detriment must be reported immediately to Natural Resources Wales via our new hotline number 0300 065 3000.</p>	<p>These are addressed in the ES. Refer to Section 10.6 (Geology and Soils) and the need for all of these matters is acknowledged in Section 15.7 Mitigation.</p> <p>The need for a permit to discharge water from the quarry sump when pumping down is acknowledged.</p> <p>The reference to a 'lagoon' is unclear, however, we assume that the reference is in relation to the remaining sump lagoons within the site. Monitoring of any discharge will be carried out by the site environmental management team</p>	<p>Place greater stress on the environmental protection elements listed.</p> <p>The former silt lagoons, which lie at the bottom of the existing flooded sump, will be used during extraction. That is one of the reasons for pumping down the existing water-filled sump. Details of the measures taken to protect the river from pollution are set out in Chapters 14 and 15.</p> <p>Water quality sampling in the lake was completed in November 2016</p> <p>Application for a discharge consent is underway. A Spill Plan will be prepared and agreed with Natural Resources Wales before works commence. A monitoring regime for the discharge to the river will also be agreed with Natural Resources Wales before works commence.</p> <p>A separate discharge consent may be required and submitted.</p>
<p><b>Requirement 1: Mitigation measures for unsuspected contamination</b></p> <p>Section 10.5.24 refers to potentially burying any asbestos that is encountered. We advise that you seek the advice of NRW Waste Regulation team for information and advice on the appropriateness of the proposed approach.</p> <p>Certain wastes, for example asbestos, are classed as Hazardous Wastes and shall only be disposed of by registered waste carriers to an appropriate facility, licensed to take such wastes.</p> <p>All works at the site must be carried out in accordance with PPG6: 'Working at construction and demolition sites: PPG6' which is available at the Gov.uk website:</p> <p><a href="https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/485215/pmho0412bwfe-e-e.pdf">https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/485215/pmho0412bwfe-e-e.pdf</a></p> <p>Table 10.8 lists "Soil and human health" as a potential receptor from the "Mobilisation of existing contaminants in made ground during earthworks". This table should also include the surface water (Afon Seiont) as a potential receptor.</p> <p>A limited amount of intrusive site investigation has been carried out, however, there should be recognition that unsuspected contamination may be encountered during the development. There are also, areas, such as the standing water/lake in the quarry that could contain contamination, for example, the underlying sediments that will be exposed once the water is drained. An explanation on how these potential risks would be dealt with, or what mitigation measures are place for such unsuspected contamination should be submitted.</p> <p>Section 14.4.11 concludes that the risk of groundwater flooding is low, based on the lack of evidence of groundwater during the E-geo investigation carried out for the ground condition report. However, the E-geo Geology Report encountered groundwater rising to 2 metres below ground level in the agricultural</p>	<p><b>Discovery of asbestos</b></p> <p>We agree that NRW Waste regulation team's advice should be sought in the event of further asbestos being found. The only asbestos of any significance that was found during the investigation was within easily identified demolition rubble contained within a small tank base. This could be disposed of off-site in accordance with best practice by a licence carrier. It is extremely unlikely that any asbestos will be found elsewhere on the site, but if found (and identified) could be disposed of in a similar manner.</p> <p><b>(Afon Seiont) as a potential receptor</b></p> <p>The Afon Seiont could be a potential receptor of any contamination, however, the contamination investigation did not identify any contamination or elevated concentrations of chemical parameters and therefore there is no 'source' for which contaminants could be leached.</p> <p><b>Unsuspected contamination</b></p> <p>The site was formerly a brickworks. Brick manufacturing is a process which does not generate significant contaminating elements. Furthermore, the site of the brickworks was covered with a sealed surface, and so the likelihood of unsuspected contamination being present is very low.</p> <p>The sump was excavated by clay extraction for use in brick manufacturing. The operator's intention was to continue brick-making. The site has been secure at all times with locked vehicle access. With such restricted access, fly-tipping of</p>	<p>Paragraph 10.4.27 Develop a plan for disposal of any asbestos or treatment of any contamination that is found to be agreed with NRW as part of the pre-construction preparations.</p> <p>Table 10.8 will be updated to include the surface water (Afon Seiont) as a potential receptor.</p> <p>Section 10.5 Mitigation: add to report to acknowledge that unsuspected contamination may be encountered during the development.</p> <p>Paragraphs 10.4 24, standing water in the quarry that could contain contamination, for example, in the underlying sediments that will be exposed once the water is drained. An explanation on how these potential risks would be dealt with, or what mitigation measures are place for such unsuspected contamination will be included within the application for the temporary discharge consent. Paragraph 15.6.4: Water quality sampling in the lake was completed in November 2016.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.6.1: A monitoring regime for the discharge to the river will be agreed with Natural Resources Wales before works commence.</p>



Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (c):</b> response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
<p>field north east of the quarry pond/lake. Confirmation is required that this information has been taken into consideration.</p> <p>Section 14.7.6 states continuing de-watering activities may be necessary during extraction and restoration to allow dry working conditions. An abstraction permit from NRW may be required for this activity.</p>	<p>contaminated materials from vehicles is not possible and any other form of unauthorised tipping is very unlikely.</p> <p>Demolition of the brickworks was carried out by a reputable contractor with arisings taken away. The only materials left on site are unsold bricks, which have been scattered to reduce the likelihood of sale. Some of these brick heaps have been flooded as the sump filled with water. The risk of contamination within sediments is very low or nil.</p>	<p>Paragraph 15.5.9: Application for a new discharge consent is underway, specific to the pumping of the sump is being progressed.</p> <p>A Spill Plan will be prepared and agreed with Natural Resources Wales before works commence.</p>
<p>Ecology and Nature Conservation</p> <p>1) This chapter should be updated to include reference to the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 Sections 6 and 7 which supersede Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Sections 40 and 42.</p>	<p>Part 1 of the Environment Act sets out Wales' sets out the statutory '<i>principles of sustainable management of natural resources</i>'</p> <p><b>Section 6 - Biodiversity and resilience of ecosystems duty</b></p> <p>Section 6 of the Act places a duty on public authorities to '<i>seek to maintain and enhance biodiversity</i>' so far as it is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions. In so doing, public authorities must also seek to '<i>promote the resilience of ecosystems</i>'. The duty replaces the section 40 duty in the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC Act 2006), in relation to Wales, and applies to those authorities that fell within the previous duty.</p> <p>Public authorities will be required to report on the actions they are taking to improve biodiversity and promote ecosystem resilience.</p> <p><b>Section 7 - Biodiversity lists and duty to take steps to maintain and enhance biodiversity</b></p> <p>This section replaces the duty in section 42 of the NERC Act 2006. The Welsh Ministers will publish, review and revise lists of living organisms and types of habitat in Wales, which they consider are of key significance to sustain and improve biodiversity in relation to Wales.</p> <p>The Welsh Ministers must also take all reasonable steps to maintain and enhance the living organisms and types of habitat included in any list published under this section, and encourage others to take such steps.</p> <p>Part 1 of the Act, including Sections 6 and 7, came into force on May 21, 2016.</p>	<p>Update include referencing to Environment (Wales) Act 2016. Sections 6 and 7.</p>
<p><b>Requirement 2: Proportionate mitigation/compensation for the loss of the lake</b></p> <p>2) The ES acknowledges that the permanent loss of the quarry lake would represent an impact of high magnitude. Proportionate mitigation/compensation for the loss of the lake does not appear to have been proposed. We do not consider the permanent loss of the lake in this way to be acceptable.</p>	<p>The comment is based on a lack of understanding of the assessment method, or a failure to read the Ecology chapter.</p> <p>The 'lake' (as referenced by NRW) is the engineered quarry sump which is part of the permitted mineral extraction and is currently performing the task of sump by receiving water draining from the exposed slopes of the clay and overburden. Nothing about its function has changed and it will remain as an active sump until the quarry is restored. Reference to this quarry sump is given in the July 2000 Environmental Statement (see <a href="https://diogel.cyngor.gwynedd.gov.uk/swiftlg/imagetemp/20532-343424.pdf">https://diogel.cyngor.gwynedd.gov.uk/swiftlg/imagetemp/20532-343424.pdf</a>.)</p>	<p>Check for any inaccurate references in ES to a 'lake' and replace with correct 'quarry sump'.</p> <p>History of the filled quarry sump is set out in paragraphs 3.3.10 to 3.3.15</p> <p>See the following Sections and paragraphs: 2.4.11, 9.9.14,</p>

Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (c):</b> response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
The habitat constitutes one of the standing open water habitats on the Environment (Wales) Act 2016, Section 7 list of the habitats of principal importance for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity in relation to Wales and should also be considered in the context of the aims of the Water Framework Directive.	The NRW are right to quote the ES as stating that the impact on the sump (lake) is of high magnitude. This does need to be understood in the context of the full ecological assessment which is reported in Chapter 9 of the ES. The assessment method (Section 9.6) explains the meaning of magnitude. However, reference to Table 9.4 shows how magnitude is combined with the value of the asset to determine the Impact Significance. The conclusion that this assessment reaches is that while the impact on the sump does represent one of high magnitude, it is impacting a feature of local value (see para 9.8.5), which, using the impact assessment methodology, results in only a minor significant impact.	See response above
The lake should either be retained as part of permanent restoration of the site; <b><i>or its loss at least proportionally compensated for, and net biodiversity gains sought. Compensation habitat could take the form of the creation of a pond complex over the fill area, including ponds ranging in sizes, shapes, depths and profiles; ideally created over a period of years.</i></b> This would result in creation and development of a wide range of standing water/wetland habitats at different stages of succession/colonisation. If suitable, clay extracted from the quarry could be used to line the ponds created.	<p><b>1. Comment on the adequacy of mitigation for the loss of the sump</b></p> <p>The NRW cannot have seen the proposed mitigation scheme which is indicated and described in the ES text and drawings.</p> <p>While the current permissions allow the lake to be pumped down at any time, the permitted ROMP restoration scheme would result in a permanent waterbody. This would result be a very steep-sided void filled with water. Very little shallow water habitat would be provided. The lake would be over 30 metres deep with sides sloping at gradient of 1:1 to 1:2. Even with some restoration improvements to the lake margin there would be only a very narrow strip of water around the edge that would have real nature conservation value.</p> <p>The difference between the new proposals in this application and the ROMP would be the permanent loss of the potential to provide a lake.</p> <p>It would be useful to know what NRW mean by proportionate mitigation? The proposed scheme will not provide a large deep water lake, but instead provide a lot of shallow water habitat through various parts of the site.</p> <p><b>However, NRW</b> say that "proportionate mitigation/compensation for the loss of the lake does not appear to have been proposed", they do not refer to our proposals at all, which makes it unclear as to whether they have read and rejected our proposals as being insufficient, or whether they have not noticed them. The mitigation proposed in section 6.2.2 and in other places is as follows: <b>'As the current proposal includes the permanent loss of the lake, replacement water features will be created at the restoration stage. In particular, a ditch or narrow linear water body, providing shallow water habitats, will be created around the perimeter of the filled sump to catch surface water draining off the restored slopes. This will provide replacement standing water habitat for use by birds and amphibians. It is also proposed to create a permanent shallow waterbody where the brickyard is currently located across the river. This will also create a valuable standing water habitat.'</b></p>	<p>Express the benefits of proposed mitigation more strongly and explain benefits more clearly.</p> <p>The quarry sump is a hazard with deep water and steeply sloping sides. The Applicant has experience of managing a similar site elsewhere and considers that the risks are too great to justify retention of the flooded sump.</p> <p>A more detailed description of the proportionate mitigation for the loss of the quarry sump is provided in Section 2.7 of the ES. These measures will more than compensate for the loss of any shallow water habitat and will provide net biodiversity gains. The compensation habitat will take the form of a pond complex over the fill area, and within the brickyard across the river, that will include ponds ranging in sizes, shapes, depths and profiles.</p>

Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (c):</b> response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
<p><b>Requirement 3: An assessment of freshwater fisheries</b></p> <p>3) No assessment of freshwater fisheries impacts from the proposal appears to have been undertaken, either as a discrete habitat or with regard to its broader, in-combination value across the site as a whole. We do not have any site-specific data but the lake and/or its drainage channel are likely to have been colonised by locally native fish species and/or artificially stocked with coarse fish. This requires further consideration with regard to temporary and permanent environmental effects. We strongly recommend that fisheries survey information is gained and appropriate plans for managing risks/impacts are made.</p> <p>a. The quarry lake and drainage channel are very likely to constitute supporting habitat for eels. A collapse in the European eel (<i>Anguilla anguilla</i>) populations of around 95% since the 1980s means that this species is of high conservation interest with loss of freshwater habitat identified as one of the driving factors. Transposition of European Community eel stock recovery regulations into UK regulations resulted in the coming into force of the Eel Regulations 2009. One key aim of these regulations is to maintain habitat accessibility for eels during the freshwater life stages. The impact on eels from the proposed changes on the water bodies on site, especially the permanent loss of the quarry lake requires assessment. The European eel is listed on the Environment (Wales) Act 2016 Section 7 list of the living organisms of principal importance for the purpose of maintaining and enhancing biodiversity in relation to Wales.</p> <p>b. If coarse fish species or other locally non-native fish are present within the lake then their management (e.g. translocation to another site), is likely to be subject to fishery licencing from NRW or may otherwise constitute an offence.</p> <p>c. Fishery Survey and fish movement licencing requirements can be discussed with NRW Fisheries Officer Richard Pierce – contact details richard.pierce@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk – Mobile 07775 822292.</p> <p>4) The ES acknowledges that the quarry lake is likely to support amphibians but does not mention common toad (<i>Bufo bufo</i>). It is quite probable that the lake constitutes an important component in supporting this Environment (Wales) Act 2016 Section 7 species. The risk of impacts on toads should be assessed in more detail given the nature of the proposals.</p> <p>5) The invertebrate interest of the water features on site does not appear to have been assessed and should be considered in greater detail.</p> <p>6) The value of the open water habitat should be assessed in the context of the broader area and how it contributes to, extent, connectivity and resilience of this habitat type in the wider setting.</p>	<p>This was not highlighted as an issue at the Scoping stage, see <a href="https://diogel.cyngor.gwynedd.gov.uk/swiftlg/imagetemp/46689-326584.11.15.pdf">https://diogel.cyngor.gwynedd.gov.uk/swiftlg/imagetemp/46689-326584.11.15.pdf</a></p> <p>A discussion with the NRW Fisheries Officer would be useful. Fish movement licence may be required. What would be the routine requirements for draining the sump under existing permissions? Would a fisheries licence be required to drain the sump? <b>Also it is worth re-iterating that the act of draining of the sump does not actually fall under this proposal – that is covered by the existing quarry permissions and it is only the permanent loss of the lake that the ES considers.</b></p> <p>Regarding point 3a, an assessment of eels could be incorporated into the chapter. They mention that “one key aim of these regulations is to maintain habitat accessibility for eels during the freshwater life stages.” The proposals would result in aquatic habitat loss, but wouldn't affect connectivity at all, so I think this could be fairly easily addressed.</p> <p>Point 4) Regarding toad – not mentioned, as not records of any locally, however, they are correct that it could be present. <b>We do state in section 4.11.18 that, in order to protect amphibians using the lake, “good practice mitigation measures will therefore be employed during works to the [sump]”. We didn't expand upon these general mitigation measures, but these could easily be expanded to address any potential impacts to toads.</b></p> <p>Point 5) assessment of invertebrate interest of the water features. <b>We could address this through a fairly basic assessment of the habitats present and a desk study to look for records of protected or notable invertebrates.</b></p>	<p>RML duly consulted with the NRW Fisheries officer Richard Pierce –Mobile 07775 822292 <a href="mailto:richard.pierce@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk">richard.pierce@naturalresourceswales.gov.uk</a> and his comments/advice have been incorporated into the ES. Advice included: use a 20mm mesh for pump intake cage. Maintain observation of the sump during pumping down and if fish seen allow for trapping and relocation of fish and for fisheries licence application.</p> <p>Pumping down of the sump is already permitted as a routine activity of the quarry extraction.</p> <p>Eel connectivity, toads, invertebrates and otter connectivity expanded in ES.</p>
<p>7) The proposal to restore the quarry void to an area of level, free draining ground does not afford the area a high potential for biodiversity. We recommend that further effort is made to optimise biodiversity value of the area.</p>	<p>The area of level, free-draining ground is the Applicant's preference for the restoration scheme. What happens once restoration is completed will be a product of future vegetation management and natural regeneration. The area will be managed as part of the wider restored landscape, with overall biodiversity benefits.</p>	<p>No action</p>

Category of 'substantive response' Class (c): response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
8) Given the connectivity to the river Seiont, otters would be expected to frequent the drain from the quarry lake and the lake itself. This area would be expected to constitute supporting habitat for this species. The undisturbed nature of the quarry lake and the proximity to the river catchment boundary suggest it is likely to have value as a catchment boundary crossing point for otters, between the River Seiont and River Gwyrfa catchments. NRW have raised similar concern regarding the landscape connectivity impacts expected to occur in this locality as result of the planned Caernarfon and Bontnewydd bypass. In combination effects require consideration.	<p>Point 8) regarding the catchment boundary crossing point issue – <b>as the drain leads only to the flooded sump and the sump is surrounded on all sides by quite steep, open habitats, we don't see that the site itself would be likely to provide a better route for otter movement than any of the other adjacent habitats / valley slopes.</b> In fact other locations nearby have woodland cover for otters ascending the valley sides.</p> <p>Is there any evidence of otter using the drain and flooded sump, or is this pure speculation? NRW state: <i>expected to constitute supporting habitat for this species</i>'.</p> <p>The proposed restoration will provide a considerably better habitat for otter connectivity.</p> <p>The quarry restoration will not affect connectivity for otter moving between river catchments because the completed landscape will provide wetland habitat to a similar geographical extent as the existing water-filled sump.</p>	Section 2.5 of the ES describes the restoration scheme which addresses the concerns regarding habitat loss and replacement habitat
9) Biosecurity is not mentioned in detail within the ES. The potential for transfer of invasive non-native species and/or introduced diseases of native flora and fauna into, within and out of the site requires further consideration given the nature of proposed operations and possible impacts.	<p>The proposed scheme of restoration will include the import of soils from the bypass construction site. All this material will be classified as inert waste which will be recovered for engineering purposes. An application for an Environmental Licence has commenced with a Waste Recovery Plan issued to NRW.</p> <p>Inert waste (see the table 15.5 in Chapter 15 for categories of waste) cannot include invasive non-native species. The Restoration scheme will include measures to revegetate the quarry and manage the vegetation. An aftercare plan could be prepared to include measures to control of any invasive non-native species if they arise.</p> <p>Controlling diseases of native flora will require measures to be added to the ES as mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Section 15.7 Measures to control non-native invasive species and diseases of native flora and will implemented in the ES.</p> <p>Include the preparation of a restoration aftercare plan as a requirement of completing the restoration scheme.</p> <p>Ensure that the final waste recovery plan and other documents associated with the Environmental Permit as well as the Aftercare Plan will set out how non-native invasive species will be controlled.</p> <p>The DAS includes a revision to ensure that suitable planning conditions can also help to satisfy any concerns for additional, future measures and controls.</p>
10) The chapter makes reference to a flood attenuation area proposed in the location of the old brickworks on "the peninsula of the River Seiont" to the southwest of the quarry. This proposal appears to be more of a restoration of flood plain function rather than what would normally be classed as a flood attenuation feature. Restoration of natural flood plain function is of course to be welcomed from both flood risk and nature conservation perspectives.	<p>Noted and acknowledged</p> <p>A Lawful Use permission issued in 2002 (code C01A/0750/14/TC) confirms that this part of the site has the benefits of a separate land use, as a brick stocking area, without any mineral quarrying consents.</p>	References to 'Flood attenuation' has been changed to 'restoration of flood plain function' in the ES.



Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (c):</b> response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
<p><b>Requirement 4: Assessment of the Water Framework Directive</b></p> <p>1) The chapter makes reference to the objectives of the Water Framework Directive (WFD) but does not go on to assess impacts on meeting the objectives of the directive from the proposed in filling of the quarry lake. We refer back to the above, Ecology and Nature Conservation Chapter, comments regarding aquatic habitats and species on the site. Permanent loss of the aquatic habitat on the site would be contrary to the key aim if WFD: to maintain and improve the aquatic environment.</p> <p>2) The quarry lake constitutes part of the Seiont WFD river catchment and should be considered a contributory factor in meeting WFD objectives there, even if loss of the quarry lake would not affect over all WFD status given the low resolution at which it is feasible to measure this.</p> <p>3) The lake's nutrient status may be of interest as it may be oligotrophic, or mesotrophic, unlike much of the pond/lake habitat in the immediate area that is more likely to be eutrophic.</p>	<p>Did they raise these issues at Scoping Stage? They need to give us the evidence to confirm why it is they're using reference to aquatic habitat? I.e Is this merely a comment?</p>	<p>Refer to the ES Ecology chapter and Section 2.5 which sets out the proposed restoration scheme in greater detail.</p>
<p><b>Requirement 5: Updated Bat survey</b></p> <p>There is a 'lack of specific bat survey' information available as such we are unable to assess how the site is being used by bats for roosting, commuting and foraging. The previous bat survey for this site is four years out of date, and as it was carried out in late September only provided limited information on bat use of the site throughout the year.</p> <p>It's known that lesser horseshoe bats hibernate within the building of the quarry site (although not within this application boundary), and there are a number of Shwegler bat boxes up on trees within the site as compensation for a previous demolition. Bats are likely to be using the woodland, woodland edges and the lake/ ditches for foraging and commuting. Therefore, any work that would impact on any of these features may have an adverse effect on bats.</p> <p>The proposed access road appears to join the proposed A487 where it intersects several hedgerows. This point has been identified as a lesser horseshoe bat commuting/foraging route, and a culvert has been proposed at this location to help the bats cross the A487 safely (This point has been known as NRW3). The access road junction will need to design so that it does not impact on the effectiveness of the proposed NRW3 culvert.</p> <p>In section 9.8.19, it states that there are no records of badgers within 1km of the survey Area and no evidence of badger activity in the survey area. It should be noted that evidence of badger was found during an NRW and Gwynedd Council site visit on the 11/05/16. (Approx. grid ref: SH4942 6156).</p>	<p>In the absence of bat survey date specific to this scheme, the ES draws in data from a number of surveys carried out between 2012 and 2016 that have covered the site and adjacent habitats. This has now been expanded to include the most recent surveys carried out for the A487 Bypass project. Combined with a habitat-based assessment of the site's potential to support roosting, foraging and commuting bats, this does provide a significant amount of relevant data for the site. It is acknowledged that bat surveys were not carried out specifically for this scheme, but also suggested that, using all this available information, an assessment of the site's use by roosting, commuting and foraging bats can be and has been made. However, in the light of the absence of scheme-specific survey data, a precautionary approach is taken to the impact assessment.</p> <p>NRW note that bats are likely to be using the woodland, woodland edges and the lake/ ditches for foraging and commuting and that any work that would impact on any of these features may have an adverse effect on bats. This is agreed, and was stated in the ES, and the mitigation which will be implemented in order to avoid any adverse impacts is detailed. For further clarity in this matter, a summary table has been added to Section 9.13 (Summary and Conclusions) which shows each potential impact and mitigation required to avoid that impact.</p> <p>In relation to the proposed bat culvert underneath the bypass, having now seen the plans showing the location of culvert NRW3, the route of the proposed quarry haul road will be modified to ensure that it does not impact on the effectiveness of the proposed culvert. However, it is important to be reminded that the haul road will only provide access to the bypass site for the duration of construction. Once the new road in completed the haul road will be closed off. The point of entry from the haul road to the bypass site will be moved to ensure that the hedgerows around the culvert are not affected by construction. The haul road will be used in normal working hours and will rarely be used when bats are flying and therefore there would not be any insignificant levels of nocturnal disturbance as a result of traffic on the haul road.</p>	<p>ES Ecology and Nature Conservation chapter has now been amended to take into account 2016 survey data.</p> <p>Potential impacts and mitigation on bats: ES For further clarity in this matter, a summary table has been added to Section 9.13 (Summary and Conclusions) which shows each potential impact and mitigation required to avoid that impact.</p> <p>Haul road entry point will be amended to avoid conflict.</p>

Category of 'substantive response' Class (c): response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
<p><b>Badgers</b></p> <p>In section 9.8.19, it states that there are no records of badgers within 1km of the survey Area and no evidence of badger activity in the survey area. It should be noted that evidence of badger was found during an NRW and Gwynedd Council site visit on the 11/05/16. (Approx. grid ref: SH4942 6156).</p>	<p>NRW comment that evidence of badger was found in May 2016. The grid reference provided relates to a location near a hedgerow, approximately 50m outside of the site boundary. Whilst evidence of badger was not found during the survey in November 2016, the ES does not rule out the presence of badger on the site, only records that setts were not found to be present. ES paragraph 4.11.19 specifies that "if badgers establish any setts prior to construction, appropriate mitigation measures would be required to ensure compliance with the relevant legislation". These measures would be incorporated into the Construction Method Statement prior to the commencement of the project. Unless the observations made in May 2016 related to the presence of a badger sett, it is considered that this issue is sufficiently covered in the ES.</p>	<p>Why were we not notified of 'evidence of badger'?</p>
<p><b>Requirement 6: Assurance the temporary permission is for a maximum of 5 years</b></p> <p>We recommend addressing the impact of climate change on flow volumes when assessing the flood risk. It appears that the current consultation relates to a time period of between 5 and 10 years as stated. We would expect that a maximum time period of 5 years would be specific to a temporary planning permission.</p> <p>The Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) (Waterco Ltd. April 2016) submitted in support of the current consultation did not contain any allowance for climate change in flow volumes. We recommend considering/providing comments on the impact of climate change allowances up to the year 2026. Current guidance suggests +10% in flow volume up to 2025 (PAG3 October 2006). However as of 1st December 2016 Welsh Government are advising that the change factor by the 2020's should be +15% for West of Wales (further details at <a href="http://gov.wales/topics/planning/policy/policyclarificationletters/2016/cl-03-16-climate-change-allowances-for-planning-purposes/?skip=1&amp;lang=en">http://gov.wales/topics/planning/policy/policyclarificationletters/2016/cl-03-16-climate-change-allowances-for-planning-purposes/?skip=1&amp;lang=en</a> ).</p> <p>We would advise that the FCA (without cc. allowances) is deemed acceptable in demonstrating that the flood risk can be managed for the proposal if temporary for 5 years.</p> <p>We would however advise that the discharge of waters from the quarry void into the Afon Seiont (ES-para. 14.4.4) should have an agreed management plan to reduce the potential for any increased flood risk downstream. It is noted and accepted that a discharge consent was issued which limited the quantity. However it may be appropriate to limit the timing of pumping in relation to (high) river levels.</p> <p>We note that there will not be an increase in surface water run-off rates since impermeable areas are not to be increased.</p> <p>As the FCA indicates that flood depths and velocities will affect/compromise access/egress along Seiont Mill Road (velocities in excess of table A1.15 of TAN15: Development and Flood Risk) we recommend that the Local Planning Authority seeks the view of the Emergency Planners with regards to emergency evacuation.</p> <p>Works in or within 8m of the main river (River Seiont) may be subject to a Flood Risk Activity Permit under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. Details available at <a href="https://naturalresources.wales/apply-for-a-permit/flood-risk-activities/?lang=en">https://naturalresources.wales/apply-for-a-permit/flood-risk-activities/?lang=en</a></p>	<p>Planning law suggest that a temporary planning permission can last up to 10 years – and generally no more. This is a planning matter more directly controlled by: construction, timing and other consents. The current permission last for a longer period than 5 years. At the back of this is the existing minerals planning permission – which lasts a lot longer!</p>	<p>To clarify the situation, the duration of the temporary elements of the permission, which are located on the lower ground is no longer than 5 years from commencement of construction.</p> <p>The Flood Consequences Assessment and the Drainage Chapter of the ES have been amended.</p>
<p><b>Air Quality</b></p> <p>It is noted that the smaller dust (&lt;10µm diameter) particles can travel 1000m or further depending on wind speed and precipitation. If a 1000m screening distance is used the only designated site is Afon Seiont which is a geological SSSI so not affected. The wind rose (Fig 6.1) indicates that the predominant wind direction is from the South–west, thus taking the dust away from this SSSI. As such we have no further requirements on air quality.</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>	<p>No action required</p>

Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (c):</b> response of Natural Resources Wales	Applicant's comments	Actions
<p>SSSI</p> <p>No designated geological SSSI or Geological Conservation Review (GCR) sites are affected by either of the proposed schemes.</p> <p>A designated Regionally Important Geodiversity Site (RIGS) named Pen-y-Bryn lies within the areas affected by both schemes A &amp; B. The importance of the RIGS feature, the need to conserve it appropriately as a feature within the quarry restoration scheme and the need to maintain appropriate access to the RIGS into the future are all duly considered within the PAC documents and the EIA.</p> <p>The restoration plan (drawing B3. Dwg 3030-16) shows that a mix of woodland planting and scattered tree/scrub planting is being proposed for this area. This contradicts the EIA which states that key geological exposures through the overburden (glacial sediment) will be retained or created. These objectives are not compatible. For the RIGS feature to remain exposed in section and available for study and research will require a degree of openness in these areas. Consequently, the final design of the RIGS exposures/faces and the density/distribution of tree planting in this area to be subject to ongoing discussions with key RIGS and NRW personnel to achieve a satisfactory outcome.</p> <p>If works will involve significant earth-moving and excavation activities, these will present good opportunities – across the site - for geological sampling and the study/recording of temporary exposures would be highly beneficial from a scientific point of view.</p> <p>We strongly recommend consultation be sent to the principal RIGS personnel (in this case Dr Kenneth Addison at Oxford University kenneth.addison@spc.ox.ac.uk) for comment.</p>	<p>RIGS is discussed in ES and proposals for protection of exposures agreed. However, Kenneth Addison has advised that the RIGS is virtually destroyed within the quarry, but that the bypass might cut through deposits.</p>	<p>Paragraph 2.7.11, 10.4.14 and 10.6.5: Consider amending the planting scheme to keep trees away from the RIGS. Observation of works by geologists is assumed and the Applicant can liaise with RIGS staff as necessary for watching brief or taking of samples.</p>
<p>Landscape</p> <p>We strongly recommend consultation with Snowdonia National Park.</p> <p>Our comments above only relate specifically to matters that are included on our checklist "Natural Resources Wales and Planning Consultations" (March 2015) which is published on our website: (<a href="https://naturalresources.wales/planning-and-development/planning-and-development/?lang=en">https://naturalresources.wales/planning-and-development/planning-and-development/?lang=en</a>).</p> <p>We have not considered potential effects on other matters and do not rule out the potential for the proposed development to affect other interests, including environmental interests of local importance. The applicant should be advised that, in addition to planning permission, it is their responsibility to ensure that they secure all other permits/consents relevant to their development.</p>	<p>The scheme is within a permitted quarry and will ensure earlier restoration of the site that would occur if the current situation continues. At closest the site is 5.7 km from the National Park at Betws Garmon. The only area with a theoretical view (assuming not intervening vegetation etc, is over 6km from a hilltop location to the east of Betws Garmon.</p>	<p>The Snowdonia National Park Authority (SNPA) have not been consulted by invitation because they are not statutory consultee for the application. With the closest viewpoint within the National Park lying over 6km away, and given that the changes proposed within the existing permitted quarry are only a very minor component in that view it is clear that any change would be barely perceptible assuming the very best of viewing conditions.</p>

Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (b):</b> Matters from the response of: Cadw	Applicant's comments	Actions
The grade II registered park and garden known as Morfa Common Park (PGW (Gd) 38) is located within the 1km study area for the proposed development. Whilst Morfa Common Park does not appear to be mentioned in chapter 7 of the Environmental Statement (Cultural Heritage), it is discussed in chapter 8 (Landscape & Visual) at paragraph 8.5.20 and identified in fig 8.7 Landscape Designations. Chapter 8 states that 'the ZTV indicates that the proposal would be visible from the Morfa Common Park' but that views are intermittent and would be interrupted by parkland trees and woodland in Seiont river valley. The Environmental Statement concludes that there will be no change to the significance of visual effects and we have no reason to disagree with this conclusion.	Acknowledged	Morfa Park Gradell Park and Garden added to Cultural Heritage Chapter.
Finally, there may also be undesignated historic assets that could be affected by the proposed development and, if you have not already done so, we would advise that you consult the Historic Environment Record held by the] Gwynedd Archaeological Trust, Craig Beuno, Ffordd y Garth, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2RT; www.heneb.co.uk/.	Acknowledged. This has been carried out and forms the basis for the assessment.	No further action required.
Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (b):</b> Matters from the response of: Gwynedd County Council Transportation and Street Care	Applicant's comments	Actions
The Transportation Service as Highway Authority has no objections to the proposals as presented at this pre-application stage	Acknowledged	No further action required.
It is however noted that during the initial construction stage all quarry traffic will have to make use of the existing quarry access via Ffordd Felin Seiont, from the A487 roundabout. The Transportation Service would therefore advise that a Traffic Management Plan be submitted as part of any full application. In addition, it is advised that a road and structure condition survey be undertaken prior to commencement	Acknowledged	Traffic Management Plan to be prepared.  We are awaiting information from Gwynedd Council regarding landownership on Seiont Mill road, and on Details of listed bridges and their 'risk 'status along Seiont Mill Road.
Please note the bridge's parapet wall at the access to Seiont Mill Road has often been damaged by heavy traffic when the site was operating as a brick works therefore it is recommended that the TMP addresses this problem and includes a mitigation plan to prevent further damage whilst the existing access is used during the initial construction stage. (	Acknowledged  on request -A plan showing the relevant bridge and the extent of adoption along Ffordd Felin Seiont was provided).	Traffic Management Plan prepared to address the need to avoid damage to the walls. Long or overly large vehicles will be required to have a banksman through the bends on Seiont Mill Road.
Matters from the response of: Health and Safety Executive (HSE) not consulted in the PAC process – outside the process.	Applicant's comments	Actions
The proposed development site which you have identified does not currently lie within the consultation distance (CD) of a major hazard site or major accident hazard pipeline; therefore at present HSE does not need to be consulted on any developments on this site. However, should there be a delay submitting a planning application for the proposed development on this site, you may wish to approach HSE again to ensure that there have been no changes to CDs in this area in the intervening period	Acknowledged	No further action required.



Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (a):</b> Matters from the response of: Welsh Government Department of Economy and Infrastructure	Applicant's comments	Actions
With reference to the above proposal, the Welsh Government as Highway Authority for the A487 Trunk Road, would offer no direction in respect of the proposed development	Acknowledged	No further action required.
Category of 'substantive response' <b>Class (d):</b> Matters from the response of: Welsh Water	Applicant's comments	Actions
<p><b>SEWAGE TREATMENT</b></p> <p>The draft application form indicates that both phases of the proposed development will dispose of foul and surface water to the public sewer; however, the draft application pack fails to demonstrate that alternative options for the disposal of surface water have been explored. Dwr Cymru Welsh Water would OBJECT to the proposed disposal of surface water to the public sewer.</p> <p>As statutory sewerage undertaker, it is our duty to carry out assessments of the anticipated foul discharges from the proposed development, as well as mitigating measures to enable a connection to the public sewerage system. In this case, however, the proposed development would overload the Waste Water Treatment Works. No improvements are planned within Dwr Cymru Welsh Water's Capital Investment Programme and we would consider any development prior to improvements being made to be premature. We would therefore OBJECT to the proposed disposal of foul water to the public sewer</p>	<p>Our consultation with Welsh Water during preparatory stages of the scheme indicated that they had no objection and that the site requirement for an additional 30 people was within their sewage works capacity.</p> <p>The response appears unclear in how they've arrived at the conclusion and the justification.</p> <p><b>Surface Water</b></p> <p>Application forms for both schemes and the details included with the ES reports, indicate surface water to be discharged into 'soakaways'. This arrangement is consistent with the original factory and quarry. Only one of the application form also indicating the possibility of a mains sewer – this reference will be deleted in the revised submission. We can confirm that the intention is to dispose any surface water by other means and not via the mains sewer. The ES states in Chapter 15, Section 7, paragraph 15/7/2 'Foul drainage will also be separated by using the existing sewer connection.' This chapter of the ES confirms that the intention has, and will continue to be developed on the basis of a non – mains sewer surface water disposal.</p> <p><b>Foul waste/water disposal.</b></p> <p>As advised, the site has an existing piped connection to the mains, which served the brickworks factory (demolished around 2011) with a substantial number of staff and visitors. Details available to us indicate the existing sewer connection point and line to and from the site, based on this previous building located within the site.</p> <p>As advised, one of the planning applications includes a temporary planning permission for a limited period only. This is unlikely to include more than a 5 year period.</p> <p>We've reviewed some of the more recent planning applications in the locality, including Gwynedd Planning Authority's reference c12/0563/14/LL. Plans accompanying this planning permission reference (for a caravan site) includes the details of the existing public sewer line to the north of that site – along Seiont Mill Road (that proposal does not show any mains connection – as we understand that the sewer location details are only for information purposes.)</p> <p>We have requested clarification from Welsh Water regarding any potential changes to the current foul system; the date when has the waste water treatment system reached capacity, when the system will be upgraded.</p>	<p>Consider alternatives and amend ES to reflect these. However, the proposal does not include surface water disposal via the existing main pipe connection to the sewage works.</p> <p>Following post-PAC correspondence with Welsh Water, (in which it remained unclear if all the submitted documents were read) and the draft planning application forms details pointed out regarding surface water disposal, they maintain an objection to the use of the existing main sewer connection for foul water disposal from the site. The application has been revised to remove reference to the connection to the existing public sewer connection on the site. Instead a storage tank will be used to serve the construction compound. This will be above ground and will be placed outside the potential flood zone area.</p>

<p><b>WATER SUPPLY</b></p> <p>A water supply can be made available to service this proposed development. The developer should contact us at the above address or on telephone 0800 9172652 for further information on this matter. I trust the above information is helpful and will assist you in forming water and drainage strategies that should accompany any future planning application. I also attach copies of our water and sewer extract plans for the area, and a copy of our Planning Guidance Note which provides further information on our approach to the planning process, making connections to our systems and ensuring any existing public assets or infrastructure located within new development sites are protected.</p>	Acknowledged	Applicant will Contact WW at the due time if an increased supply is required.
--	--------------	---

#### 4.2 Community Consultees

Matters from the response of:	Applicant's comments	Actions
None received, but refer to paragraph 2.2.4.		

#### 4.3 Adjacent landowners/neighbours (including additional property owners who are close to the scheme)

Status, identity, and comments from the respondent	Responding		Support the proposal	Applicant's comments	Actions/ Response
	whole	part			
<p>Neighbouring Resident</p> <p>Name given. Our reference: 01</p> <p>I am concerned as to the noise and vibration of traffic and large lorries for the residents of Seiont Mill Road.</p> <p>I believe that the road going down towards the old Hanson Brick Works is not wide enough for the volume of traffic to include large lorries proposed for the site.</p>		y	No	<p>Acknowledged that the resident will have concerns.</p> <p>The Access road to the quarry is adequate and so is Seiont Mill Road, for the volume of traffic expected.</p> <p>The permitted scheme which includes the quarry and former brick factory were accessed along the road.</p> <p>Seiont Mill Road is an adopted highway that serves the existing brickyard west of the river.</p>	<p>The quarry has planning permission to carry out the extraction of minerals and so an operator of the quarry could use the existing access road and the private quarry access road to gain access to the quarry using heavy goods vehicles in accordance with the permission. Vehicles to and from the quarry will not be using Ffordd Felin Seiont east of the junction with the private quarry access road.</p> <p>The private quarry access road is sufficiently wide for the kinds of vehicles that would be required because they will be similar in size to those arriving and leaving the brickworks when it was operating. The numbers of vehicles using the road will be broadly similar to when the brickworks was operating. The speed of any vehicles between Pont Seiont Roundabout and the quarry will be restricted to 20 miles per hour for safety reasons and to reduce noise.</p> <p>The Noise assessment in Chapter 11 of the Environmental Statement, carried out in accordance with industry standards, has compared the 'worst case' noise that is likely to result from activities in the quarry with those that are derived in accordance with national policy and guidance.</p>
For	y		n/a	Acknowledged	No further action

Status, identity, and comments from the respondent	Responding		Support the proposal	Applicant's comments	Actions/ Response
	whole	part			
<p>Neighbouring Resident</p> <p>Name given. Our reference: 03</p> <p>Concerned about Air quality, cultural heritage, Ecology and nature conservation, geology and soils, noise and vibration, Community assets. Has prepared a separate written response sent by post.</p> <p>Though the Seiont Quarry and bypass projects are separate, they are closely linked. I have opposed the route chosen for the bypass for several reasons that are documented elsewhere. Many of these reasons are exaggerated further by the Seiont Quarry project. It is inevitable therefore that I should oppose the latter project. The cumulative impact of both projects is unacceptable.</p> <p>It is ironic that local residents should receive by hand details regarding the planning applications relating to Seiont Quarry a day after the closing date for submitting comments about the draft orders relating to the proposed bypass. Knowledge of the former would surely have influenced reactions to the draft orders.</p>	y		No	<p>The decision to issue the consultation letters was taken because the relevant documents were complete and available for distribution on that day. The timing is coincidental.</p>	No further action
<p>In the DAS Statement it is stated that the implications on residential properties would be considered (1.4.3). Though such implications are noted, there is no indication that any specific action would be taken to alleviate the impact other than those which would be undertaken had there been no residential properties in the first place.</p>				<p>The proposed mitigation measures have been proposed for both temporary and permanent situation. Short term mitigation is proposed to address those environmental impacts that will arise from in the short-term activity that might cause dust and noise, for example. With the operation and restoration of the quarry planned to be completed within a few years, it follows that short-term mitigation would only provide short term. Where possible, proposed mitigation is incorporated into the permanent scheme.</p>	<p>We refer the resident to the full environmental statement. The key Chapters that address the impacts on residents in their own properties are:</p> <p>Chapter 8: Landscape and Visual Impact</p> <p>Chapter 11: Noise and Vibration</p> <p>Chapter 13 Traffic Generation and Effects</p> <p>The various actions that are required to mitigate for impact are also set out in these reports and shown in various drawings, and include design of the landform and planting of the restoration scheme, noise attenuation measures, localised speed restrictions and prohibited routes for construction traffic.</p> <p>The full set of drawings will provide a full picture of the proposed scheme, however, the most relevant drawings, showing the scheme during working and restoration, are:</p> <p>B3.Dwg3030 – 13A &amp; B (Working Plans)</p>

Status, identity, and comments from the respondent	Responding		Support the proposal	Applicant's comments	Actions/ Response
	whole	part			
					B3.Dwg3030 – 16 Restoration Plan.
It is noteworthy that it is stated that consultations have taken place with a number of organisations but <b>none</b> with local residents, with whom no direct contact has been made (Environmental Statement. 1.5.1)! From the onset of the bypass project, all contact with planners, Welsh Government, local council etc regarding issues of personal concern have been initiated by myself. Not once have I been approached directly to discuss matters of importance relating to my property and me.				<p>This PAC process has been undertaken specifically to allow local residents to give their views. If consultations are completed early in the development of a scheme the public response is to complain that there is nothing to comment on.</p> <p>The PAC process allows comment before the planning application is submitted.</p>	<p>Consultations carried out in the development of this application have been completed in accordance with the requirements of legislation. From experience, we know that consulting local residents early in the development of a scheme often generates the response that there is insufficient detail on which to comment. We chose to consult with a scheme that is well-developed so that the detail was available for comment. The new Pre-Application Consultation (PAC) was introduced as a formal method of consulting Specialist Consultees (such as NRW) Community Consultees (local politicians), and adjacent landowners. We have exceeded the consultation requirement by including neighbouring residents, not just adjacent landowners.</p>
With reference to TAN 12 (DAS Statement. 6.3.3) there is no evidence that the “character” of my property has had any attention. It is noted that my property (Bryn Eglwys) is a listed building near to the site (Sustainability Statement). (Incidentally, Penrhos is NOT a listed building.) Throughout, much has been made, both written and spoken, of the importance of <b>heritage</b> in considering projects of this magnitude. This is no more than empty rhetoric, as not at any stage have I been approached by any organisation or authority to discuss this matter, and neither has there been any indication of mitigating actions. The Local Planning Authority’s Policy B3 rules that it will <b>pay particular attention to the need to safeguard the setting of Listed Buildings</b> (Environmental Statement. 7.3.11). My property is such an asset, and yet there is no indication that the setting would be safeguarded.				<p>The Environmental Statement has assessed the impact of the scheme on Bryn Eglwys as a residential property and as a Listed Building. Direct contact with the owner of the property would not have assisted in protection of the heritage.</p> <p>The LVIA, for example, assesses the visual impact of both proposed schemes on Bryn Eglwys. No mitigation is proposed for Bryn Eglwys only, but as part of a plan for wider mitigation on residential properties.</p> <p>References to Penrhos in the Environmental Statement do not describe it as a Listed Building.</p>	<p>The assessment of heritage has used published information about listed properties and other important or designated sites. There is sufficient information in these public sources and so there is no need to disturb the owners/occupiers of heritage properties. The assessment is therefore based on objective data.</p> <p>In both the working and restored situations the existing setting of the listed building has been safeguard. The scheme incorporates mitigation measures and these have previously been referenced (see action/responses above). The existing quarry and all the associated activities of extraction, <b>material processing and activity in the yard are all part of the existing minerals permission</b>. We therefore have provided essential mitigation to address the most significant impacts in the working period of the existing permitted quarry, as an enhancement to the current situation. The restoration scheme will be</p>



Status, identity, and comments from the respondent	Responding		Support the proposal	Applicant's comments	Actions/ Response
	whole	part			
					implemented thereafter and will provide a more naturalistic vegetated landform.
In the Non-Technical Summary (B5a) it is quoted, "whilst the impact of 'the scheme' alone will not be significant, the <b>cumulative</b> impacts caused by the proposed bypass, in addition to this scheme in the quarry, are considered likely to contribute a <b>significant direct detrimental landscape impact on the locality.</b> "				Acknowledged and checked.	Text in the NTS has been amended to clarify this point.
It is stated that some of the residential properties with existing views of the quarry are likely to experience some <b>adverse impacts</b> during the construction phase, and that there would be <b>no</b> impact from lighting (Sustainability Statement). It is <b>incorrect</b> to state that the cumulative effects of the bypass and quarry development would <b>not</b> be detrimental, certainly to my property. The mitigation measures alluded to do not exist in my case. It is stated that noise should not pose a significant constraint for the proposed development. The word "should" is not reassuring. I have past experiences of activities at this site, and am fully aware of the noise and dust created by topsoil stripping, excavating etc. It is interesting to note (DAS Statement) that noise attenuation bunds would be used to protect some adjacent householders and commercial properties from the effects of noise and disturbance, including that from batching plants and construction vehicles (2.1.21) (2.2.7). Such measures have not been considered for other properties, such as mine. New haul roads (3.3.2) during and after the construction of the bypass, incorporating a gradient, would inevitably create more vehicular noise.  Whatever parameters are used I strongly disagree with the assessment of impact upon the 3 listed elements at my property in that it would <b>not be significant</b> , especially considering the cumulative effect of both quarry and bypass projects. (ES. 7.8.6); also that the magnitude of change is no more than <b>neutral or slight</b> (ES. Table 7.6).				The property already has views into the existing quarry and mineral extraction is permitted. This matter is dealt with in the ES LVIA and these indicate that the visual impact will be slightly adverse for the period of activity, but improving to slightly beneficial once the restoration scheme is completed.	The impact on the property is addressed in the Environmental Statement. No further action required.
I object most strongly to ES 8.8.12 - "Lighting within the site compound may also be noticeable from Bryn-eglwys and Penrhos on the ridge between Caethro and Bontnewydd. As these properties face the town of Caernarfon the view of lights experienced may be indistinguishable from existing street lighting around the Eryri Hospital and Bodfan				The property already has views into the existing quarry and mineral extraction is permitted. Lighting and activity in the quarry as a result of this proposed scheme would occur for a shorter period than would be the case for the permitted quarry which would	The impact on the property is addressed in the Environmental Statement. No further action required.

Status, identity, and comments from the respondent	Responding		Support the proposal	Applicant’s comments	Actions/ Response
	whole	part			
<i>complex. The significance of visual effect is judged as no change.”</i> Despite the computer-generated data, the reality is that lights from the brickworks would be within a wider field of vision and, of course, would have a significant visual effect from Bryn Eglwys. <sup>[SEP]</sup>				otherwise remain until 2042. Furthermore if the scheme goes ahead the restoration would be completed earlier too.	
I refer to Environmental Statement 8.9.13 – “VIS Ref 2TA.1 Bryn-eglwys and 2TA.3 Penrhos overlook the part of the existing quarry and fields through which the Bypass would run. Existing vegetation contributes a screen to views of the existing quarry, and would also contribute a screen to views of the Bypass. From first floor rooms some of this vegetation can be seen over. The Bypass would be constructed on a low embankment, and in cut near to these properties. Once proposed woodland and hedgerows planted to screen the Bypass have become established, views of the quarry would be interrupted.” Again despite the computer generated data, here I would suggest that any screen for Bryn Eglwys by trees is mainly a result of my project of creating a woodland, professionally designed and planted about 15 years ago. Trees were on purpose planted close to maintain mutual support during the early years of growth. The woodland is being, and will be, thinned as part of the development. The trees are deciduous. It follows that any screening will be only partial at best, and especially so in the winter. Even at this stage of woodland development, during the winter months, it is possible to see the concrete brickyard of the quarry. It is inevitable that the proposed office block, car park, processing plant, batching plants, servicing building etc will be visible from Bryn Eglwys (B3. Dwg3030-13B. Application Drawings). It is noted that one access to a temporary access haul road is close to, and in direct view of my property at a distance of 235 metres (Dwg3030-13A. Application Drawings).  It is clear that some activities would take place within the quarry outside normal working hours (DAS Statement. 2.1.21), thus causing even more disruption.				Acknowledged that this resident has planted a woodland which is now well-established and that when the bypass is completed there will still be a view into the quarry.	<p>The quarry will be restored and revegetated as soon as possible after the bypass is completed with benefit to views from properties and public viewpoints.</p> <p>The assessment, whilst starting from a computer-generated map showing areas where topography alone (assuming no intervening features such as vegetation or buildings) would allow a view of the proposals, is actually based on a visit by an experienced landscape architect to each location. For the property at Bryn-eglwys the visit was achieved using the public footpath across the garden. The assessment also has to take into account the existence of the existing permitted quarry and compares the proposed scheme to the existing situation.</p> <p>The impact of the bypass is not considered in the ES beyond the estimated cumulative impact.</p> <p>Activity outside the normal working hours will be very limited and when it does will occur to shorten the overall time take to complete the bypass.</p>
Whilst the predictions stated in the Environmental Statement minimises the impact on air quality locally, it is difficult to accept this. The combined impact of the quarry activities and bypass construction will inevitably have an adverse effect at times on my property. I am concerned about dust pollution created by vehicles and concrete				Addressed in the ES.	Please refer to the Environmental Statement

Status, identity, and comments from the respondent	Responding		Support the proposal	Applicant's comments	Actions/ Response
	whole	part			
production, and air pollution through diesel emissions. I note that distances from activities are to dwellings, when in fact distances to land and gardens are also very relevant. For example, in my situation some of these activities will take place within less than 50 metres of my land and garden.					
Whilst superficially much of the largely computer generated facts and figures may fall within acceptable parameters and guidelines, this does not represent the true picture locally. There are real concerns within major areas, especially heritage, landscape, environment, air quality, noise and the effects on community assets. The concerns within each area adds up to a very significant matter of concern. This negative impact is accentuated even more by the link to the bypass project, hence the cumulative effect. Furthermore, there has been a complete lack of support, understanding and offers of mitigation by any relevant organisation or authority				It is acknowledged that the resident has real concerns. The Pre-Application Consultation has provided an opportunity for comments about the Applicant's proposals to be made. Where feasible the scheme and the planning application documents have been amended to address comments from a number of responses.	The completed assessments are included with the planning application documents.
Neighbouring Resident Name given. Our reference: 04  Consideration of alternatives; Cultural heritage, noise	y		No	Concerns noted. These are generic concerns that perhaps would be better addressed by setting out where information is provided in the ES??	The consideration of alternative sites is first referred to in Section 1.6 of the Environmental Statement, and thereafter is discussed in Section 2.1, 2.2 and then in Chapter 4. Chapter 4 sets out the main reasons as to why the Brickworks Quarry has been selected. The assessments of Cultural Heritage (Chapter 7) and Noise (Chapter 11) address these matters in some detail.
Neighbouring Resident Name not provided. Our reference: 05  Consideration of alternatives	y		No	Concerns noted. These are generic concerns that is addressed by reference to information is provided in the ES.	Please see the Action/Response set out above.
Neighbouring Resident (responded on hard copy questionnaire) Name given. Our reference: 06  Air quality, cultural heritage, Ecology and nature conservation, geology and soils, noise and vibration, Community assets, traffic generation, Drainage and Water Quality  Separate written submission: When we moved to this address in 2010, what particularly appealed to us was the tranquillity of the area	y		No	The existing quarry has existed since the 1960s. Current planning permission, to continue mineral extraction, will expire in 2042 and this was the case before the property was purchased in 2010. The Legal Search should have identified that this was the situation?  We acknowledge the concerns regarding safety.	Please refer to the Environmental Statement for a more detailed description of the proposed scheme, the impacts it might have and the mitigation proposed.  Please note that a speed limit of 20 mph is proposed for all construction related traffic using Ffordd Felin Seiont. Only certain vehicles will be allowed to use

Status, identity, and comments from the respondent	Responding		Support the proposal	Applicant's comments	Actions/ Response
	whole	part			
and wildlife. The Brickworks had closed and ceased to be operational. We are a v. small community of 15 houses. It is safe and quiet. The location makes it convenient to the vicinity of Caernarfon town centre. We have respect and regard for each other's privacy and noise and vibration. The proposal makes it unsafe for residents with.... Will also affect wildlife, noise and vibration. The volume of traffic that you propose via portacabins and haulage lorries will be detrimental to the existing road. We have seen an increase in the public using the area as a sanctuary, dog walking, taking their children to the Royal Park, etc. The slip road to and from Seiont Mill will pose a danger to passers by and was never intended for haulage and the volume of traffic that you propose.				In contrast to what is stated, the road was built specifically to carry goods to and from the quarry, first by rail and then by HGV. Large articulated brick lorries used the route to and from the quarry until recently. In fact, HGVs used to access the brickyard by driving down the full length of Seiont Mill Road and through the gates where it terminates. In future, all vehicles will use the access road to the quarry and so branch off east from Seiont Mill Road and away from the frontages of residential properties. There is no plan to repon the gates to the brickyard on Seiont Mill Road.	this route of access to the quarry and drivers will be expected to conform to site rules.





## 9 APPENDICES

- 9.1 Site notice
- 9.2 Consultation invitation letter (NOTICE)
- 9.3 a copy of the notice given to owners and occupiers of adjoining land;
- 9.4 copies of all notices provided to councillors, town and community councils,
- 9.5 copies of all notices provided to specialist consultees;
- 9.3 Contents list for documents available during the PAC
- 9.3 Questionnaire
- 9.4 Consultations carried out before this PAC consultation

### APPENDIX 9.1A: SITE NOTICE (in Welsh)

#### ATODLEN 1 Erthygl 4(4) Hysbysiadau cyn-ymgeisio

**ATODLEN 1B Erthyglau 2C a 2D CYHOEDDUSRWYDD AC YMGYNGHORI CYN GWNEUD CAIS AM GANIATÂD CYNLLUNIO Gorchymyn Cynllunio Gwlad a Thref (Gweithdrefn Rheoli Datblygu) (Cymru) 2012**

#### **CYHOEDDUSRWYDD AC YMGYNGHORI CYN GWNEUD CAIS AM GANIATÂD CYNLLUNIO HYSBYSIAD O DAN ERTHYGLAU 2C A 2D**

(i'w gyflwyno i berchnogion a/neu feddianwyr tir cyffiniol ac ymgylgoreion cymunedol; ac i'w arddangos drwy hysbysiad safle ar neu gerllaw lleoliad y datblygiad arfaethedig)

**Diben yr hysbysiad hwn:** mae'r hysbysiad hwn yn rhoi cyfle i wneud sylwadau yn uniongyrchol i'r datblygwr ynglŷn â datblygiad arfaethedig cyn cyflwyno cais am ganiatâd cynllunio i'r awdurdod cynllunio lleol ("ACLI"). Bydd unrhyw gais cynllunio dilynol yn cael ei hysbysebu gan yr ACLI perthnasol; ni fydd unrhyw sylwadau a ddarperir gennych wrth ymateb i'r hysbysiad hwn yn lleihau dim ar eich gallu i gyflwyno sylwadau i'r ACLI ar unrhyw gais cynllunio cysylltiedig. Dylech nodi y gellir gosod unrhyw sylwadau a gyflwynir gennych yn y ffeil gyhoeddus.

Datblygiad Arfaethedig yn **Chwarel Seiont, Ffordd Melin Seiont, Caernarfon**

Rwyf yn hysbysu bod **Jones Bros, Ruthin** yn bwriadu gwneud ceisiadau am ganiatâd cynllunio i :

- A) Defnyddio tir fel estyniad i'r safle cwrt adeiladwaith presennol a darparu sied cynnal a chadw a ffordd halio traffig adeiladwaith i'w defnyddio yn ystod gwaith adeiladu'r ffordd osgoi arfaethedig A487 Caernarfon-Bontnewydd am gyfnod o rhwng 5 a 10 mlynedd (caniatâd cynllunio dros dro)
- B) Ffurio ffordd halio newydd, barhaol ar ochr ogleddol y chwarel sy'n bodoli eisoes gyda chysylltiad dros dro i'r ffordd osgoi arfaethedig A487 Caernarfon-Bontnewydd yn ystod y cyfnod adeiladu, parhau i echdynnu deunyddiau chwarel, ynghyd â defnyddio deunydd llenwi oddi ar y safle, o safle adeiladu'r ffordd osgoi, at ddibenion peirianeg ac adfer y chwarel.

Gellwch archwilio copïau o'r: cais arfaethedig; y planiau; a dogfennau ategol eraill ar-lein yn [www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html](http://www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html) ac mae cyfleusterau cyfrifiadur ar gael i archwilio'r wybodaeth hon ar lein yn **y Llyfrgell, Allt Y Pafiliwn** rhwng yr oriau **09.30 – 19.00 Dydd Llun, Dydd Mawrth, Dydd Iau, Dydd Gwener: 09.30 -13.00 Dydd Mercher a Dydd Sadwrn** neu, yn swyddfa safle Chwarel Seiont drwy gysylltu Mr Bryn Williams, Swyddog Cysylltiadau Cyhoeddus Gwaith Brics Seiont ar **07786 513571** neu [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com).

neu

Gellwch weld yr wybodaeth hon yn **y Llyfrgell, Allt Y Pafiliwn** rhwng yr oriau **09.30 – 19.00 Dydd Llun, Dydd Mawrth, Dydd Iau, Dydd Gwener: 09.30 -13.00 Dydd Mercher a Dydd Sadwrn** neu, yn swyddfa safle Chwarel Seiont drwy gysylltu Mr Bryn Williams, Swyddog Cysylltiadau Cyhoeddus Gwaith Brics Seiont ar **07786 513571** neu [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com).

# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

*ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS*

Mae'n rhaid i unrhyw un sy'n dymuno gwneud sylwadau ynglŷn â'r datblygiad arfaethedig hwn ysgrifennu neu ebostio'r asiant: Richards, Moorehead & Laing Ltd, drwy ddefnyddion un o'r opsiynau canlynol;

1. Llenwi a chyflwyno'r ffurflen **holiadur ar-**

**lein** <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/YDCW55G> **NEU;**

2. Llenwi ac anfon **copi papur o'r holiadur** ar-lein drwy'r post i: 'Holiaduron', Richards, Moorehead & Laing Ltd, 55 Stryd y Ffynnon, Rhuthun, Sir Ddinbych, LL15 1AF. Mae'r holiadur i'w gael yn y Llyfrgell, Allt y Pafiliwn, Caernarfon, LL55 1AS fel â ddisgrifwyd uchod

3. Llenwi ac anfon **copi papur o'r holiadur trwy'r post**. Mae copiâu o'r ffurflen ar gael yn swyddfa safle Chwarel Seiont. Am resymau iechyd a diogelwch fe'ch cynghorir i gysylltu â Swyddog Cysylltiadau Cyhoeddus Gwaith Brics Seiont, Mr Bryn Williams, ar 07786 513571 neu bryn@jones-bros.com i wneud trefniadau addas, yn cynnwys unrhyw geisiadau i weld y pwll clai sy'n bodoli eisoes.

Erbyn **11 Tachwedd 2016**



Llofnod:

Dyddiad: **14 Hydref 2016**

### APPENDIX 9.1B: SITE NOTICE: (in English)

#### SCHEDULE 1 Article 4.(4) Pre-application notices

#### SCHEDULE 1B Articles 2C & 2D PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION BEFORE APPLYING FOR PLANNING PERMISSION Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012

#### PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION BEFORE APPLYING FOR PLANNING PERMISSION NOTICE UNDER ARTICLES 2C AND 2D

(to be served on owners and/or occupiers of adjoining land and community consultees; and displayed by site notice on or near the location of the proposed development)

**Purpose of this notice:** this notice provides the opportunity to comment directly to the developer on a proposed development prior to the submission of a planning application to the local planning authority ("LPA"). Any subsequent planning application will be publicised by the relevant LPA; any comments provided in response to this notice will not prejudice your ability to make representations to the LPA on any related planning application. You should note that any comments submitted may be placed on the public file.

Proposed development at **Seiont Quarry, Seiont Mill Road, Caernarfon.**

I give notice that **Jones Bros, Ruthin** is intending to apply for planning permissions to:

- A) Use of land as an extension to the existing site compound area and the provision of a maintenance shed and construction traffic haul route to be used during the construction of the proposed A487 Caernarfon-Bontnewydd bypass route for a period between 5- 10 years. (Temporary planning permission)**
- B) Formation of a new, permanent haul road on the northern boundary of the existing quarry with temporary connection to the proposed A487 Caernarfon-Bontnewydd bypass route during the construction period, the continued extraction of quarry materials, and the importation of use of off- site fill material from the bypass construction site for quarry engineering and restoration purposes**

You may inspect copies of: the proposed application; the plans; and other supporting documents online at [www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html](http://www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html) and computer facilities are available to view this information online at **the Library, Pavilion Hill, Caernarfon** between the hours of **09.30 – 19.00 Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday: 09.30- 13.00 Wednesday and Saturday** or, at the Seiont Quarry site office by contacting Mr Bryn Williams, Seiont Quarry Public Liaison Officer on 07786 513571 or [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com).

Or

You may view this information at **the Library, Pavilion Hill, Caernarfon** between the hours of **09.30 – 19.00 Monday, Tuesday, Thursday, Friday: 09.30 13.00 Wednesday and Saturday** or, at the Seiont Quarry site office by contacting Mr Bryn Williams, Seiont Quarry Public Liaison Officer on 07786 513571 or [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com).

# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS

Anyone who wishes to make representations about this proposed development must write or email to the agents, Richards, Moorehead & Laing Ltd, by one of the following options:

1. Completing and submitting the **online questionnaire** form

<https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/YDCW55G> OR;

2. Completing and submitting a **paper copy** of the online questionnaire by post to:

'Questionnaires', Richards, Moorehead & Laing Ltd, 55 Well Street, Ruthin, Denbighshire, LL15 1AF. The questionnaire is available at the Library, Pavilion Hill, Caernarfon, LL55 1AS as described above.

3. Completing and submitting **by post a paper copy** of the questionnaire which is available at the Seiont Quarry site office. For Health and Safety reasons, you are advised to contact the Seiont Brickworks Public Liaison Officer, Mr Bryn Williams on 07786 513571 or [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com) to confirm suitable arrangements, including any requests to view the existing clay pit.

by the **11 November 2016**



Signed:

Date: **14 October 2016**

### APPENDIX 9.2B LETTER TO ADJACENT LANDOWNER (in Welsh)

Swj/3030/11

14 Hydref 2016

PERCHENNOG/ DEILYDD

Ty

CAERNARFON

LL55 XXXX

#### Annwyl Perchennog/ Deilydd

**Parthed:** CEISIADAU CYNLLUNIO AR GYFER GWAITH DROS DRO A GWAITH PARHAOL YN CHWAREL SEIONT, FFORDD MELIN SEIONT, CAERNARFON, AR RAN CWMNI JONES BROS, RHUTHUN, SIR DDINBYCH.

**Cam Cynllunio:** Cyhoedduswydd ac ymgynghori cyn ymgeisio am ganiatâd cynllunio dan Orchymyn Cynllunio Gwlad a Thref (Gweithdrefn Rheoli Datblygu) (Cymru) 2012 (Hysbysiad dan Erthyglau 2C a 2D)

#### Pam rydym ni'n ymgynghori:

Mae RML yn ymgynghori'n eang i ddarparu cyfle i chi weld a chyflwyno eich sylwadau ar y cynigion ar gyfer gwaith dros dro a gwaith parhaol yn Chwarel Seiont cyn i ni gyflwyno dau gais cynllunio i Gyngor Gwynedd. Mae hyn yn rhan newydd o'r broses ymgynghori ar geisiadau cynllunio yng Nghymru. Gobeithiwn y bydd eich sylwadau chi yn ein cynorthwyo i gyflwyno cynnig mor gyflawn â phosibl.

Nodwch, ni fydd enwau a chyfeiriadau y rhai a ymatebodd yn cael eu datgelu yn unrhyw ddogfennau terfynol a gyhoeddir. Hefyd cewch gyfle i gyflwyno sylwadau ffurfiol ynghylch y cais cynllunio pan gaiff ei gyflwyno i Gyngor Gwynedd.

Pan gyflwynir cais cynllunio i Gyngor Gwynedd bydd y cyngor yn cynnal proses ymgynghori ar wahân. Bydd unrhyw sylwadau a gyflwynir i Gyngor Gwynedd yn cael eu rhoi ar y gofrestr gyhoeddus.

#### Aelodau ward etholaethol neu ward cymuned

Mae'r aelodau ward etholaethol neu gymuned ar gyfer yr ardal wedi derbyn gwahoddiad ymgynghori tebyg. Mae rhestr ynghlwm o'r enwau a'r cyfeiriadau perthnasol, os ydych chi'n dymuno cysylltu â nhw.

#### Cyflwyno sylwadau ac edrych ar y cynigion:

Os ydych chi'n dymuno cyflwyno unrhyw sylwadau am y cynigion hyn dylent ein cyrraedd ni (RML) yn ysgrifenedig erbyn 11 Tachwedd 2016 trwy lenwi ffurflen a'i dychwelyd trwy un o'r dulliau a ganlyn:



# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS

1. Llenwi a chyflwyno'r ffurflen holiadur ar-lein <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/YDCW55G> NEU;

2. Llenwi ac anfon copi papur o'r holiadur ar-lein drwy'r post i:  
Holiaduron, Richards, Moorehead & Laing Ltd, 55 Stryd y Ffynnon, Rhuthun, Sir Ddinbych, LL15 1AF.

Mae'r holiadur i'w gael yn y Llyfrgell, Allt y Pafiliwn, Caernarfon, LL55 1AS fel a ganlyn:

Dydd Llun	09.30 - 19.00
Dydd Mawrth	09.30 - 19.00
Dydd Mercher	09.30 - 13.00
Dydd Iau	09.30 - 19.00
Dydd Gwener	09.30 - 19.00
Dydd Sadwrn	09.30 - 13.00
Dydd Sul	Ar gau

3. Llenwi ac anfon copi papur o'r holiadur trwy'r post. Mae copïau o'r ffurflen ar gael yn swyddfa safle Chwarel Seiont. Am resymau iechyd a diogelwch fe'ch cynghorir i gysylltu â Swyddog Cysylltiadau Cyhoeddus Gwaith Brics Seiont, Mr Bryn Williams, ar 07786 513571 neu [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com) i wneud trefniadau addas, yn cynnwys unrhyw geisiadau i weld y pwll clai sy'n bodoli eisoes.

Gellir gweld y cynigion trwy:

a. Defnyddio'r ddolen ar-lein, sef [www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html](http://www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html)

b. Edrych ar gopi wedi'i argraffu neu ddefnyddio cyfrifiadur cyhoeddus i weld y dogfennau trwy'r ddolen uchod yn y Llyfrgell, Allt y Pafiliwn, Caernarfon, LL55 1AS, yn ystod yr oriau a amlinellir yn eitem 2 uchod.

c. Gweld y dogfennau yn Swyddfeydd y Safle, Gwaith Brics Seiont, Ffordd Melin Seiont, Caernarfon. Am resymau iechyd a diogelwch fe'ch cynghorir i gysylltu â Swyddog Cysylltiadau Cyhoeddus Gwaith Brics Seiont, Mr Bryn Williams, ar 07786 513571 neu [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com) i wneud trefniadau addas, yn cynnwys unrhyw geisiadau i weld y pwll clai sy'n bodoli eisoes.

# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

*ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS*

### Gwybodaeth ychwanegol

Efallai eich bod chi eisoes yn ymwybodol o'n cais cynllunio blaenorol a gyflwynwyd i, ac a gymeradwywyd gan Gyngor Gwynedd yn 2015 yn ymwneud â defnyddio rhan o'r safle fel cwrt adeiladwaith dros dro. Gellir gweld yr holl ddogfennau'n gysylltiedig â chynnig 2015 un ai trwy wneud trefniadau i ymweld â swyddfa'r Adran Gynllunio ym Mhwlheli, neu trwy'r ddolen hon:

<https://diogel.cyngor.gwynedd.gov.uk/swiftlg/apas/run/WPHAPPDETAIL.DisplayUrl?l>

Yr eiddoch yn gywir



Ivor G Richards OBE

Rheolwr Gyfarwyddwr

Richards, Moorehead and Laing Ltd



### APPENDIX 9.2B LETTER TO ADJACENT LANDOWNER (in English)

Swj/3030/11

14 October 2016

OWNER / OCCUPIER

House

CAERNARFON

LL55 XXXX

Dear Owner / Occupier

**Re:** FUTURE PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT WORKS AT SEIONT QUARRY, SEIONT MILL ROAD, CAERNARFON ON BEHALF OF JONES BROS, RUTHIN, DENBIGHSHIRE.

**Planning Stage:** Publicity and consultation before applying for planning permission under the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012 (Notice under Articles 2C and 2D)

**Why we're consulting:**

RML are consulting widely to provide you with an opportunity to view and comment on the proposals for temporary and permanent works at Seiont Quarry before we submit two planning applications to Gwynedd Council (GC). This is a new part of the planning applications 'consultation' process in Wales. We hope that your comments will help us make this proposal as complete as possible.

Please note that names and addresses of respondents will be withheld in any final, published documents. You will also have the opportunity to comment formally on the planning application when it is finally submitted to GC.

When a planning application is submitted to GC, they will undertake a separate consultation process. Any comments submitted to GC may be placed on the public register.

**Community or electoral ward members**

The community or electoral ward members for the area have also received a similar consultation invitation. If you wish to contact them, please find attached list of the relevant names and addresses.

**Submitting comments and Viewing the proposals:**

If you wish to submit any representations about this proposal they should reach us (RML) in writing by 11 November 2016 by completing and returning by one of the following options:

# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

*ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS*

1. Completing and submitting the online questionnaire  
form <https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/YDCW55G> OR;

2. Completing and submitting a paper copy of the online questionnaire by post to:  
Questionnaires, Richards, Moorehead & Laing Ltd, 55 Well Street, Ruthin, Denbighshire, LL15 1AF. The questionnaire is available at the Library, Pavilion Hill, Caernarfon, LL55 1AS) between the hours of:

Monday	09.30 - 19.00
Tuesday	09.30 - 19.00
Wednesday	09.30 - 13.00
Thursday	09.30 - 19.00
Friday	09.30 - 19.00
Saturday	09.30 - 13.00
Sunday	closed

3. Completing and submitting by post a paper copy of the questionnaire which is available at the Seiont Quarry site office. For Health and Safety reasons, you are advised to contact the Seiont Brickworks Public Liaison Officer, Mr Bryn Williams on 07786 513571 or [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com) to confirm suitable arrangements, including any requests to view the existing clay pit.

The proposals can be viewed by:

a. Visiting the online link at [www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html](http://www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html)

b. Accessing either a printed copy or using public computer facilities to view the documents through the above link at the Library, Pavilion Hill, Caernarfon, LL55 1AS, during the hours as outlined in item 2 above.

c. Viewing the documents at the Site Offices, Seiont Brickworks, Seiont Mill Road, Caernarfon. For Health and Safety reasons, you are advised to contact the Seiont Brickworks Public Liaison Officer, Mr Bryn Williams on 07786 513571 or [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com) to confirm suitable arrangements, including any requests to view the existing clay pit.

# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

---

*ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS*

**Additional information.**

You may already have been made aware of our previous planning application submitted to, and approved, by GC in 2015 which related to using part of the site as a temporary construction compound. All documents in connection with the 2015 proposal can be viewed either by making arrangements to visit the Planning Department office at Pwllheli or, alternatively through this link:

<https://diogel.cyngor.gwynedd.gov.uk/swiftlg/apas/run/WPHAPPDETAIL.DisplayUrl?l>

Yours sincerely



Ivor G Richards OBE

Managing Director

Richards, Moorehead and Laing Ltd

### APPENDIX 9.3A: LETTER TO SPECIALIST CONSULTEES (in Welsh)

20161010  
Swj/apcs/3030/11  
10 Hydref 2016

*Os ffonio, gofynnwch am: Shan Jones neu Andrew Sumner*

[Address]

**ATODLEN 1C Erthygl 2D YMGYNGHORI CYN GWNEUD CAIS AM GANIATÂD CYNLLUNIO**

**Gorchymyn Cynllunio Gwlad a Thref (Gweithdrefn Rheoli Datblygu) (Cymru) 2012**

**YMGYNGHORI CYN GWNEUD CAIS AM GANIATÂD CYNLLUNIO HYSBYSIAD O DAN ERTHYGL 2D**

(i'w gyflwyno i **ymgyngoreion arbenigol**, fel y'u diffinnir gan erthygl 2(1) o Orchymyn Cynllunio Gwlad a Thref (Gweithdrefn Rheoli Datblygu) (Cymru) 2012

**Diben yr hysbysiad hwn:** mae'r hysbysiad hwn yn ddeisyfiad ffurfiol am ymateb i ymgynghoriad cynymgeisio o dan erthygl 2D o Orchymyn Cynllunio Gwlad a Thref (Gweithdrefn Rheoli Datblygu) (Cymru) 2012.

Datblygiad arfaethedig yn **Chwarel Seiont, Ffordd Melin Seiont, Caernarfon.**

Rwyf yn hysbysu bod **Jones Bros, Ruthin** yn bwriadu gwneud ceisiadau am ganiatâd cynllunio i:

- A) Defnyddio tir fel estyniad i'r safle cwrt adeiladwaith presennol a darparu sied cynnal a chadw a ffordd halio traffig adeiladwaith i'w defnyddio yn ystod gwaith adeiladu'r ffordd osgoi arfaethedig am gyfnod o rhwng 5 a 10 mlynedd (caniatâd cynllunio dros dro)**
- B) Ffurfio ffordd halio newydd, barhaol ar ochr ogleddol y chwarel sy'n bodoli eisoes gyda chysylltiad dros dro i'r ffordd osgoi arfaethedig yn ystod y cyfnod adeiladu, parhau i echdynnu deunyddiau chwarel, ynghyd â defnyddio deunydd llenwi oddi ar y safle, o safle adeiladu'r ffordd osgoi, at ddibenion peirianeg ac adfer y chwarel.**

Mae copi o'r cais arfaethedig; planiau; a dogfennau ategol eraill ar gael i'w harchwilio ar lein yn: [www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html](http://www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html)

Yn unol â gofynion erthygl 2E o Orchymyn Cynllunio Gwlad a Thref (Gweithdrefn Rheoli Datblygu) (Cymru) 2012, rhaid anfon ymateb i'r ymgynghoriad at [s.jones@rmlconsult.com](mailto:s.jones@rmlconsult.com) erbyn **7<sup>fed</sup> Dachwedd 2016**

# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

*ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS*

### OS GWELWCH YN DDA NODWCH:

Mae copiau papur o'r holl ddogfenau l'w gweld yn Llyfrgell, Allt y Pafiliwn, Caernarfon a swyddfyeydd y safle Chwarel Seiont. Am resymau iechyd a diogelwch fe'ch cynghorir i gysylltu â Swyddog Cysylltiadau Cyhoeddus Gwaith Brics Seiont, Mr Bryn Williams, ar 07786 513571 neu bryn@jones-bros.com i wneud trefniadau addas, yn cynnwys unrhyw geisiadau i weld y pwll clai sy'n bodoli eisoes.

Rydym wedi darparu'r ymgynghoriad hon cyn cyfnod ymgynghoriad ag aeoldau'r cyhoedd ac 'ymhgynghoria cumundeol' (fel y'u diffinnir), a fydd yn cychwyn ar y 14<sup>eg</sup> o Hydref 2016.

Llofnod:

*Wyn Richards*

55 WELL STREET, RUTHIN, DENBIGHSHIRE LL15 1AF  
Tel +44(0)1824 704366, Fax +44(0)1824 705450  
email: [rml@rmlconsult.com](mailto:rml@rmlconsult.com) web: [www.rmlconsult.com](http://www.rmlconsult.com)  
Registered in England No. 1848683 VAT Reg. No. 401 4243 13



www.rmlconsult.com

### APPENDIX 9.3B LETTER TO SPECIALIST CONSULTEE (in English)

20161010

Swj/apcs/3030/11

10 October 2016

*If telephoning please ask for: Shan Jones or Andrew Sumner*

[Address]

#### SCHEDULE 1C Article 2D CONSULTATION BEFORE APPLYING FOR PLANNING PERMISSION

#### Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012

#### CONSULTATION BEFORE APPLYING FOR PLANNING PERMISSION NOTICE UNDER ARTICLE 2D

(to be served on **specialist consultees**, as defined by article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012

**Purpose of this notice:** this notice comprises a formal request for a pre-application consultation response under article 2D of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012.

Proposed development at **Seiont Quarry, Seiont Mil Road, Caernarvon.**

I give notice that **Jones Bros, Ruthin** is intending to apply for planning permissions to:

- A) Use of land as an extension to the existing site compound area and the provision of a maintenance shed and construction traffic haul route to be used during the construction of the proposed bypass route for a period between 5- 10 years. (Temporary planning permission)**
- B) Formation of a new, permanent haul road on the northern boundary of the existing quarry with temporary connection to the proposed bypass route during the construction period, the continued extraction of quarry materials, and the importation of off- site fill material from the bypass construction site for quarry engineering and restoration purposes**

A copy of the proposed application; plans; and other supporting documents can be viewed online at: [www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html](http://www.rmlconsult.com/seiont-pac-documents.html)

In accordance with the requirements of article 2E of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012, a consultation response must be sent to [s.jones@rmlconsult.com](mailto:s.jones@rmlconsult.com) by the **7<sup>th</sup> November 2016**.

# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

*ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS*

**PLEASE NOTE:**

**Paper copies of all documents are available to view at the Library, Pavilion Hill, Caernarfon and at the Seiont Quarry site office. For Health and Safety reasons, you are advised to contact the Seiont Brickworks Public Liaison Officer, Mr Bryn Williams on 07786 513571 or [bryn@jones-bros.com](mailto:bryn@jones-bros.com) to confirm suitable arrangements, including any requests to view the existing clay pit.**

**We've provided this consultation in advance of a separate consultation with members of the public and 'community consultees' (as defined), which will commence on the 14<sup>th</sup> October 2016.**

Signed:





# R I C H A R D S

## M O O R E H E A D & L A I N G L T D

*ENGINEERING, ENVIRONMENTAL and LANDSCAPE SPECIALISTS*

www.rmlconsult.com

55 WELL STREET, RUTHIN, DENBIGHSHIRE LL15 1AF  
Tel +44(0)1824 704366, Fax +44(0)1824 705450  
email: [rml@rmlconsult.com](mailto:rml@rmlconsult.com) web: [www.rmlconsult.com](http://www.rmlconsult.com)  
Registered in England No. 1848683 VAT Reg. No. 401 4243 13



## USE FOR LANDSCAPE PAGE FORMAT

(Do not delete this paragraph mark!)→

RICHARDS, MOOREHEAD & LAING LTD  
55 WELL STREET, RUTHIN, DENBIGHSHIRE LL15 1AF  
Tel +44(0)1824 704366, Fax +44(0)1824 705450  
email: [rml@rmlconsult.com](mailto:rml@rmlconsult.com) web: [www.rmlconsult.com](http://www.rmlconsult.com)  
Registered in England No. 1848683 VAT Reg. No. 401 4243 13

