



Decision

by C MacFarlane BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

An Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 02/05/2025

Development of National Significance application reference: CAS-02628-Y1D2Z7

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990

SECTION 62D

APPLICATION BY: Seiont Ltd

**SITE ADDRESS: Seiont Brickworks site, to the southeast of Caernarfon,
Gwynedd**

- The application, dated 8 March 2024, was made under section 62D of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by the Planning (Wales) Act 2015.
 - The application is made by Seiont Ltd.
 - The Local Planning Authority is Cyngor Gwynedd.
 - The application was confirmed as valid on 23 May 2024.
 - The development proposed is described as 'Development of a 20 MWe gas fired short-term operating reserve (STOR) plant (referred to as a 'peaking plant') comprising ten natural gas-fuelled engines and associated infrastructure. The generating sets, switchroom, Distribution Network Operator building and welfare facility will all be contained within a fenced compound of approximately 3300m² area. Twin cables will be laid in a single trench alongside an existing haul road, to connect the plant to the existing local 33kV grid at a connection adjacent to the northern boundary of the quarry.'
 - A site visit was made on 4 March 2025.
 - Hearings were held on 18, 19 and 20 February 2025.
-

Decision

1. The application is refused.

Procedural Matters

2. In accordance with the introduction of the Developments of National Significance (Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2024 during the examination period, the authority to determine this application has been delegated to the appointed Inspector, rather than being the subject of a Ministerial decision.
3. The examination period was suspended from 11 July 2024 to 21 January 2025 to allow the applicant and Council to provide additional information and for subsequent consultation periods.
4. The application was subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) screening process by PEDW prior to submission, which concluded the proposal did not constitute EIA development for the purposes of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (Wales) Regulations 2017. Having considered all the evidence before me, I am satisfied that sufficient information has been provided to adequately assess the effects of the proposal on the environment and find no reason to depart from the conclusion of the EIA screening direction.
5. Welsh Government (WG) published a new Technical Advice Note (TAN) 15 'Development, Flooding and Coastal Erosion (2025)' during the examination period. That document confirms that it should be read in conjunction with Planning Policy Wales (PPW) and the Welsh National Marine Plan and that it replaces TAN 14 'Coastal Planning (1998)' and the previous TAN 15 'Development and Flood Risk (2004)'. However, the Ministerial Written Statement dated 31 March 2025, which accompanied the publication of the new TAN, confirms that there will be a transitional period for its implementation.

Specifically, planning applications that were submitted and registered before the publication of the new TAN, such as those the subject of this examination, shall continue to be assessed against the previous version. I have considered this application accordingly.

6. The formal site visit was carried out during a weekday morning, with a supplementary evening visit of the surrounding area made during weekday evening hours on 20 February 2025.

Reasons

7. I consider the main issues in the determination of the application to be:
 - (i) Whether the proposed development would be acceptable with regard to planning policies seeking to address climate change;
 - (ii) The effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area;
 - (iii) The effect of the proposed development on living conditions, with regard to noise;
 - (iv) The effect of the proposed development on air quality, with regard to human health and ecology;
 - (v) Whether the proposed development would be acceptable with regard to flood risk; and
 - (vi) Whether any harm identified in relation to the above matters would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposal.

Climate change

8. As a gas-powered electricity generation facility, the proposal would burn fossil fuel to produce power, resulting in carbon emissions. The development plan, which consists of 'Future Wales – The National Plan 2040' (FW) and the 'Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026' (LDP), does not contain any policies directly addressing such proposals.
9. LDP Policy PS 5 supports developments where they are consistent with the principles of sustainable development, and that all proposals should alleviate the causes of climate change. This is expanded upon by Policy PS 6, which states that in order to alleviate the effects of climate change, proposals will be permitted where they have taken account of, and responded to, the energy hierarchy and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
10. LDP Policies PS 7 and ADN 3 promote the development, and inclusion within schemes, of renewable energy technologies in contributing to a low carbon future. FW Policies 17 and 18, whilst strongly supporting the principle of developing renewable and low carbon energy projects, are also silent on the matter of other energy schemes. FW Policy 24 reiterates these points whilst also addressing specific locations in North-West Wales and nuclear energy proposals. Whilst together these policies demonstrate a focus on the provision of renewable and low-carbon sources of energy production, I do not consider that, in the absence of a specific policy stance, it follows that developments using other energy sources are therefore wholly unacceptable as a matter of principle.
11. PPW states that low-carbon electricity must become the main source of energy in Wales, that overall power demand is expected to increase and also

recognises the need to integrate renewable energy generation with storage and other flexibility services, in order to minimise the need for new generation and grid system reinforcement (paragraphs 5.7.1-5.7.2).

12. Although PPW does not define 'flexibility services', the proposal would enable increased short-term demands for electricity to be met quickly, thus providing flexibility to balance supply and demand by consumers. This supports my finding that local and national policy, whilst focussing on increased reliance on renewable sources of energy, does not completely preclude developments using non-renewable sources, rather it is placed at the bottom of the energy hierarchy in paragraph 5.7.13.
13. Furthermore, given the intermittent and variable nature of renewable energy sources, the proposal would provide a back-up to assist in balancing fluctuations in supply and demand, thereby contributing to a consistent electricity supply, particularly as increased reliance is placed on the use of renewable sources in meeting WG targets for energy generation set in FW.
14. Although it would not reduce energy demand by itself, as stipulated by the energy hierarchy in LDP Policy PS 6, the proposal would contribute to energy efficiency by enabling the electricity network to meet peaks in energy demand only when they occur, and would provide a back-up provision to support the use of low- and zero-carbon technologies elsewhere.
15. I note the arguments put forward regarding the potential use of other forms of flexible electricity generation and storage. However, alternative forms of technology are not before me as part of the application, and I must determine the proposal as presented and on its own merits. Nor am I persuaded that granting permission would consequently prevent proposals for other forms of electricity generation from coming forward, or that there is sufficient evidence that any reduction in renewable-sourced electricity generation is directly attributable to gas-fired developments. Furthermore, there is insufficient evidence to be assured that increased take-up of renewable and low-carbon technologies, and demand management measures, will occur at a large enough scale and in the near future as to nullify the purpose of the proposed development.
16. With regard to other developments highlighted, specifically the Glyn Rhonwy and Pentir schemes, there is insufficient information before me regarding the status of these schemes, and to provide certainty that they would negate the role of the proposed development in contributing towards a reliable and secure electricity supply.
17. Whilst the proposal, when considered in isolation, would result in increased greenhouse emissions, it would support the transition to an increased reliance on renewable and low-carbon energy, thus contributing to addressing climate change on a wider scale. I therefore find that the proposal would accord with the requirements of LDP Policies PS 5 and PS 6. Although not applicable to the nature of the development proposed, I also consider that LDP Policies PS 7 and ADN 3, as well as FW Policies 17 and 18, would not be contravened.

Character and appearance

18. The application site is located outside of the Caernarfon development boundary as identified in the LDP, and forms part of the wider Seiont quarry and former

brickworks. The site occupies an area of disturbed land, with a large hardstanding, portable cabins and a substantial industrial building nearby. Various items of heavy machinery, as well as construction materials and industrial paraphernalia, were also present at the time of my visit. The land around the wider quarry and brickworks site rises upwards to the settlement and nearby bypass, with dense vegetation and tree planting surrounding much of the quarry and brickworks boundary.

19. Despite the current industrial and developed appearance of the application site and its immediate surrounds, previous temporary permissions relating to the quarry area have expired, with conditions having been imposed requiring restoration. Although a detailed restoration plan has yet to be approved, the indicative plan imposed by condition 5 on planning permission ref C17/0011/19/MW shows the area incorporating the application site as grassland, with the majority of the wider quarry and brickworks restored to a natural vegetated condition.
20. I note the original permissions dating from the 1950s relating to extraction and brick manufacture, which allow these activities to continue until 2042, and the subsequent approvals in 2007 following a review process. However, given the lengthy time period which has passed since production ceased in 2008, with the associated buildings having been subsequently removed, and in the absence of any evidence to demonstrate otherwise, there is little to persuade me there is a realistic prospect of the permitted works recommencing in the future. Furthermore, the recent construction of the A487 Bontnewydd bypass in close proximity to the quarry and brickworks, and the alterations made to landform as a result, give rise to uncertainties regarding the viability, and possible sterilisation of part of the quarry site, for extraction.
21. As a fallback position, I therefore afford the original permissions little weight and have assessed the site and surroundings on the basis of its restored state. The proposal would therefore result in the loss of a natural and verdant area, by introducing built development into an area of open countryside.
22. However, views of the development from the surrounding area would be limited due to the existing dense vegetation enclosing much of the wider quarry area, with the greatest visibility being afforded to vehicles travelling west along the bypass where there is little or no vegetation or landform screening. Subject to conditions requiring the approval of a landscaping scheme, and the removal of the development should its use cease, the Council does not consider there would be visual harm to the surrounding landscape.
23. Given the lower topography of the site would reduce its prominence in the landscape, that views from vehicles travelling along the bypass would be experienced briefly and seen in the context of the nearby settlement, and that the additional landscaping would provide a filtering effect, I am also satisfied that the proposal would not have a significant impact on the character and appearance of the area.
24. Although the Council expresses concern regarding the effect of the proposal on the restoration scheme, little explanation has been provided to identify the harm this would cause. Due to the relatively small portion of the total restored area that the proposal would occupy, the absence of any evidence to demonstrate this would prejudice the restoration of the remaining area, and my findings

regarding the effect on character and appearance, I do not share the Council's concerns.

25. The proposal would therefore comply with LDP Policy PCYFF 3, which permits proposals where they complement and enhance the character and appearance of the site, and respect the context of the site and its place within the local landscape.
26. As set out in the applicant's supporting statement, access to an existing gas supply and electricity grid connection are essential requirements for STOR proposals, both of which are available at the site. Although located outside of the development boundary, I therefore conclude that the requirement for the proposal to demonstrate the necessity of its countryside location has been met. As such, the proposal would also conform with LDP Policy PCYFF 1, which resists development outside of development boundaries unless justified in accordance with specific policies or that its location in the countryside is essential.

Living conditions

27. The application site is located a short distance from dwellings on Seiont Mill Road to the west, Ysbyty Eryri to the north-west, and dwellings on Tyddyn Llwydyn further to the north, and separated from these properties by the Afon Seiont. During my site visits, I noted the dominant sounds in the area to be river noise and traffic from the nearby bypass, as well as occasional vehicle and pedestrian movements associated with residential development and the hospital.
28. The main source of noise from the proposed development would be the engines, which would operate to support the electricity network at times of high demand, generally during morning and early evening periods. The annual hours of operation would be restricted through the use of a planning condition.
29. Any noise impact resulting from the construction phase of the development would be short-term and could be adequately controlled by conditions restricting working hours and requiring adherence to the appropriate code of practice for construction sites, such that there would not be significant harm to living conditions in this regard.
30. Concerns have been raised regarding the adequacy of the applicant's background noise measurements used in the Noise Impact Assessment v1.0 (NIA) and subsequent additional monitoring exercise. Due to the relatively limited number and duration of measurements taken, adverse weather on some occasions, the lack of attended monitoring, and the susceptibility of the level of river noise to previous rainfall, as well as the deviations in figures when compared to the Council's check measurements, I agree that there is considerable uncertainty over the robustness of the figures presented.
31. In accepting that background levels are likely to be low, the applicant proposes a condition to limit operational noise, based on a rating level of 35 dBLAr, Tr, be applied at nearby receptors, as representing a low impact level, with additional limits inside dwellings. I note the references in the technical publications highlighted by the applicant in support of the quoted figures, however, these do not constitute definitive thresholds of acceptability to be rigidly applied in the determination of planning applications.

32. Given the lack of robustness of the background measurements provided, I cannot be confident that the proposed limits, even if agreed to be an objectively low level, would be appropriate in the specific circumstances of this case. Nor do I consider that the use of noise limits set above background levels in another DNS application highlighted by the applicant (ref. DNS/3217391) is sufficient reason to justify such an approach in this instance. There are clear differences from the application before me, with regard to the developments proposed, character of the noise produced, and prevailing noise environment, such that the circumstances are not directly comparable. I therefore do not agree with the applicant's view that additional background monitoring would serve little purpose and would not be proportionate.
33. I acknowledge the applicant's requirement for flexibility in the eventual plant model used and that the NIA modelling represents a worst-case scenario. However, notwithstanding general assurances given in oral and written submissions, there is a lack of tangible evidence before me to demonstrate that the development, including the elements other than the engines, could meet the proposed noise limits and the technological means through which this would be achieved.
34. Moreover, although the total annual operating hours would be restricted, and the engines are anticipated to be used for a lesser amount and only during peak hours, there is a lack of certainty regarding the actual pattern and duration of operation and the extent to which this may alter or increase in the future due to weather events and factors affecting the availability of other forms of energy. The effect of nearby road traffic noise, which generally increases at peak travel times, therefore could not be relied upon long-term to effectively mask noise from the proposal.
35. Given the significant proportion of the year during which the conditioned annual hours would potentially allow the development to operate, which could be at any time of day or night, and taking account of the various uncertainties I have identified, I do not consider the evidence has sufficiently demonstrated that there would be no significant harm to the living conditions of nearby residents as a result of disturbance from the operation of the development.
36. In the absence of adequate evidence, I am not satisfied that the use of conditions to defer details regarding plant specification and compliance with noise limits to a later date would be an appropriate approach given the potential permanent harm that may be caused to the well-being of nearby residents as a result of disturbed sleep and interference with their ability to enjoy their internal and external living spaces without significant disruption.
37. I therefore conclude that the proposal would fail to comply with LDP Policy PCYFF 2, which, amongst other things, seeks to prevent unacceptable adverse impacts on the amenity of occupiers due to noise.

Air quality

38. Emissions from the proposal would release Nitrogen Oxides (NO_x) into the air. With regard to human health, the applicant's Air Quality Impact Assessment v2.1 (AQIA) identifies a range of receptors in the surrounding area, including dwellings, the hospital, two schools and a nursing home. I note the Council raises no concerns regarding the selection of these receptors and, based on the range of uses and their geographical spread, I consider these to be

appropriate for the purposes of the assessment. The AQIA concludes there would be a negligible impact on the identified receptors over the long term, with a small number experiencing a slight impact in relation to short term impacts.

39. Although several numerical discrepancies have been identified within the AQIA, given the explanations provided in written submissions and during hearings, I am satisfied that these are relatively limited in their effect and do not fundamentally undermine or alter the findings within the AQIA.
40. In relation to the assessment of short-term effects, I acknowledge the concerns raised regarding the assumptions and approach taken in the AQIA. However, I consider that although specific short-term receptors have not been identified, the results presented in relation to the wider area are sufficiently detailed to enable an assessment of the impacts of the proposal. Whilst the use of 2017 as the worst-case meteorological year may not be representative for all receptors, it is appropriate for the majority identified, and the exclusion of start-up emissions from the assessment could be addressed through a suitably worded condition to restrict their level. I therefore consider that the findings in the AQIA are sufficiently robust to inform my decision.
41. I acknowledge PPW states that national air quality objectives are not 'safe' levels of pollution, and that it is desirable to keep pollution levels as low as possible. However, the anticipated emissions would represent a small percentage of the Air Quality Standard, both alone and in combination with existing background concentrations of NO₂. I also note that reported background concentrations, which take account of the recently opened bypass, have declined since production of the AQIA and that the proposal would accord with more stringent WHO targets. Although the AQIA indicates a greater concentration of emissions closer to the site, which would encroach on a Public Right of Way, given the likely transitory and occasional nature of movements along this route, I do not consider this materially undermines the conclusions drawn from the AQIA.
42. For these reasons, I consider that the proposal would not result in a significant adverse effect on nearby human receptors. In reaching this finding, I have also taken account of the lack of objection from the Council and Environmental Public Health Services Wales in relation to the effect on health, subject to conditions limiting annual operating hours, plant specification and further background monitoring.
43. Turning to ecological interests, although the annual mean Predicted Environmental Concentration for NO_x would be significantly below the Air Quality Standard at all identified ecological receptors, at ancient woodland receptors E1 and E3, nutrient nitrogen and acid deposition would exceed the 1% Critical Load threshold for the proposal's Process Contribution. The proposal would also result in the Predicted Environmental Concentration substantially exceeding 100% of the Critical Load, however, much of this is attributable to existing background concentrations already exceeding the assessment criteria. Nonetheless, the AQIA identifies there is the potential for likely significant effects in respect of nutrient nitrogen and acid deposition at receptors E1 and E3, and that further advice should be sought.
44. Whilst I acknowledge that exceedance of the Critical Load threshold does not confer certainty that harm will occur, it is apparent that the proposal would

result in additional contributions to an environment that is already exceeding the assessment criteria. Furthermore, there is a lack of substantive evidence before me to counter or amplify the findings of the AQIA relating to potential likely significant effects. I note the applicant's Ecological Impact Assessment recommends additional planting to absorb nitrogen in order to mitigate the effect of emissions, however, it was confirmed at the hearing that this predates production of the AQIA and, given the lack of detail as to the efficacy of such measures, this fails to demonstrate that adequate mitigation would be provided.

45. Although it may be the case that a significant proportion of UK woodlands experience similar excessive conditions, I do not consider the existence of unfavourable environments elsewhere to be a reason to allow harm in this instance. Given the evidence already before me of potential adverse effects, the proposed conditions relating to further monitoring and mitigation where required would not be appropriate due to the lack of certainty that these impacts could be adequately addressed. I therefore find that the proposal would not be acceptable with regard to the potential reduction in biodiversity caused by increased nitrogen and acid deposition at nearby ancient woodland receptors.
46. In addition, the AQIA identifies the wooded river corridor to the north of the application site as experiencing even greater levels of nitrogen deposition. Whilst not a designated ecological site, the harm that may arise to this area adds further to my concerns regarding the potential adverse effects of the proposal.
47. Drawing together all of the above, I conclude that the proposal would be acceptable with regard to its effect on air quality, in relation to human health, and would therefore comply with LDP Policy PCYFF 2, which seeks to prevent unacceptable adverse impacts on the health of occupiers of local residences. It would, however, cause harm in relation to the effect of air quality on ecological interests, and therefore fail to accord with LDP Policies PS 19 and AMG 5, which seeks to protect trees and woodland of ecological value, and protect and, where appropriate, enhance biodiversity.

Flood risk

48. The proposed underground cables would run from the main compound to the grid connection point to the north-east and in doing so, cross flood zone C2, as identified by the Development Advice Maps accompanying TAN 15, and flood zones 2 and 3 of the more recent Flood Map for Planning (FMfP). As I have noted earlier, the publication of a new TAN 15, which relates to the FMfP, has not formed the basis of my assessment.
49. TAN 15 paragraph 6.2 states that highly vulnerable development, which includes power stations, should not be permitted within zone C2. Although the majority of the development would be outside of this zone, the proposal as a whole would therefore conflict with the requirement of the TAN.
50. The applicant's Flood Consequence Assessment also shows that the proposed vehicular access from Seiont Mill Road would exceed the tolerable depths set out in TAN 15 during the most extreme flood event. Although not included within the red line boundary of the application site, given the lack of an authorised alternative vehicular access, and the applicant's submissions confirming the use of Seiont Mill Road, the development would clearly

necessitate the use of this access route. The development would therefore also fail to accord with the requirements of the TAN in this respect.

51. Based on the above, and in addition to being contrary to TAN 15, the proposal would conflict with the wider aim of PPW and LDP Policy PS 6 to locate development away from areas of flood risk.
52. However, the cables would be designed and installed to withstand flooding without damage, which would avoid harm to the operation of the development. In relation to access, the absence of permanent staff on-site during the development's operational phase, means that there would be little use of the access route, other than for maintenance visits, which would be occasional and could be planned to avoid extreme weather events. The construction phase would be short-term and could also be planned to avoid the presence of staff on-site during times of flood risk through the use of flood alerts. I therefore find that there would be little risk of harm to life or property from flooding and that the conflict with local and national policies would be minor.

Benefits

53. As described earlier, national and local policy sets out a clear need to promote the use of renewable and low-carbon sources of energy, and to increase the proportion of electricity consumption generated from these sources. However, the supply available from such sources is variable, particularly in relation to changing weather, and can be challenging to predict with accuracy.
54. The proposal would provide a back-up service to support the grid, allowing flexibility to rapidly balance supply and demand, thus contributing to the provision of a reliable supply of electricity. This is essential to ensuring the well-being of local communities, businesses and provision of services, particularly as greater reliance is placed on renewable sources of energy and electricity demand continues to increase in the future.
55. There is a lack of substantive evidence to support concerns raised regarding technical constraints arising from the site's location and, consequently, I have no reason to consider that the proposal would fail to deliver the benefits described. I acknowledge the letter from SP Energy Networks submitted with the application; however, the content clearly relates only to the terms of an offer for connection and does not refer to the specific need for the facility as stated by the applicant. Nonetheless, I afford significant weight to the benefits of the proposal in contributing towards a secure and uninterrupted supply of electricity.
56. The submitted Welsh Language Statement indicates that no permanent employees would be required once operational and that construction roles are expected to be filled by around 10-12 existing employees of the applicant's parent company. The positive benefits to the local economy through job creation would therefore be very limited in scale, and attract minimal weight.

Other Matters

57. Traffic generation associated with the proposal would arise from deliveries of materials and plant to the site, as well as personnel, during the construction phase. Once operational, the number of personnel visits would be for maintenance purposes and very low in number. Details of traffic management could be controlled through a condition requiring a Construction Environmental

Management Plan (CEMP). Due to the temporary and short-term nature of construction phase, and low level of operational vehicle movements, the proposal would be acceptable in relation to highway safety.

58. Given the separation distances between the application site and the World Heritage Site, Scheduled Monument and listed buildings in the wider area, and the temporary nature of any disturbance during the construction phase, the proposal would not result in harm to these features of the historic environment or their settings.
59. Subject to the inclusion of conditions, NRW does not object to the proposal in relation to the effect on protected species and sites. With specific regard to European protected sites in the wider area, I note the applicant's Habitats Regulations report concludes that significant effects on European sites and their features can be ruled out. However, I have not proceeded to carry out an assessment as to whether there would be a likely significant effect on the qualifying features of nearby European sites as I have found the proposal unacceptable on other grounds. Even if the proposal were to be acceptable in this regard, it would be a neutral factor in the planning balance given it is an expected requirement of all development.
60. Setting aside the matter of the effect on European sites, the proposal suggests mitigation measures to avoid direct and indirect adverse effects from light and water pollution, with a scheme of ecological management and enhancement to be provided. Based on the evidence before me, I am satisfied that, subject to conditions to require the submission of a CEMP, ecological management plan and lighting details, the proposal would be acceptable with regard to ecological interests not already addressed as a main issue in my appraisal.
61. In the absence of any substantive evidence to the contrary, and considering the lack of objection from North Wales Fire & Rescue, I find no reason to consider the proposal would pose an unacceptable risk in relation to disasters or other emergencies.
62. The applicant's submission concludes there would be no significant cumulative effects with the proposal and developments at Peblig Industrial Estate, and with a proposed concrete batching plant on nearby land. However, both applications have yet to be determined by the Council and, as such, have not influenced my assessment of the planning merits of the application before me.

Planning Balance and Conclusion

63. The proposal would result in harm to the living conditions of nearby occupiers, in relation to noise and, due to air quality, ecology. Given the potentially unrestricted lifetime of the development and the long-term impacts these effects would have on the well-being of nearby residents, and the duty to seek to maintain and enhance biodiversity under the Environment (Wales) Act 2016, I attribute significant weight to these matters.
64. The conflict with policies relating to flooding are afforded little weight, given I have found the proposal would be acceptable in respect of the actual risk to life and property from flooding.
65. The main benefit of the proposal would be in contributing to a reliable supply of electricity and, for the reasons set out earlier, this also carries significant weight

in my determination. The limited economic benefits attract minimal weight in favour of the application.

66. The proposal would be acceptable with regard to climate change planning policies and, subject to the imposition of conditions, the effect on air quality insofar as it relates to human health. It would also be acceptable with regard to highway safety, the historic environment, other ecological interests and safety. These are, however, normal expectations of any development and are therefore neutral factors in the planning balance.
67. In balancing these issues, I find that the harm associated with the proposal, specifically in relation to living conditions and air quality, are compelling factors that outweigh the benefits of the development for the reasons I outlined earlier in my decision. Accordingly, the application for planning permission is refused.
68. I have considered the duty to improve the economic, social, environmental and cultural well-being of Wales, in accordance with the sustainable development principle, under section 3 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 (WBFG Act). I have taken into account the ways of working set out at section 5 of the WBFG Act and consider that the findings of this decision are in accordance with the sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers well-being objectives, as required by section 8 of the WBFG Act.

Claire MacFarlane

INSPECTOR