

# Planning and Orders Committee

## Minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2021

- PRESENT:** Councillor Nicola Roberts (Chair)  
Councillor Richard Owain Jones (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors John Griffith, Glyn Haynes, T LI Hughes MBE,  
K P Hughes, Vaughan Hughes, Eric Wyn Jones, Dafydd Roberts,  
Ieuan Williams and Robin Williams.
- Councillor R A Dew – Portfolio Holder - Planning
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Chief Planning Officer (DFJ),  
Planning Enforcement Manager (SO),  
Planning Built and Natural Environment Manager (JW),  
Senior Planning Assistants (CR) & (JR),  
Development Management Engineer (Highways) (IWH),  
Legal Services Manager (RJ),  
Committee Officer (MEH).
- APOLOGIES:** None
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Members: Councillors Jeff Evans (application 7.1); Carwyn Jones  
and Alun Roberts (application 7.2); Dylan Rees (application 7.3);  
Margaret M Roberts (applications 7.4, 7.5 and 12.4); Aled M Jones  
(application 12.5).
- Councillors Bryan Owen, Bob Parry OBE FRAGS, Peter Rogers

---

### 1 APOLOGIES

None.

### 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

None received.

### 3 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the previous virtual meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee were confirmed as correct.

### 4 SITE VISITS

The minutes of the virtual site visits held on 15 September, 2021 were confirmed as correct.

## 5 PUBLIC SPEAKING

There were Public Speakers in respect of applications 7.1, 7.3, 12.4 and 12.5.

## 6 APPLICATIONS THAT WILL BE DEFERRED

None were considered by the Planning and Orders Committee.

## 7 APPLICATIONS ARISING

### 7.1 FPL/2021/144 – Full application for part demolition works together with alterations and extensions to create additional units at Llys y Gwynt, Llanfawr Close, Holyhead

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At the meeting held on 1 September, 2021 it was resolved to visit the site. A virtual site visit took place on 15 September, 2021.

#### *Public Speaker*

Mr Gwyndaf Williams, in support of the application, said that the application is to modernise and build additional units for young homeless people at Llys y Gwynt. This development, if permitted, will be a huge boost in terms of improving the quality of life and opportunities for these young people. He noted that it is important that the Planning Committee is given the following information as they consider the planning application to improve and increase the size of the scheme.

- Llys y Gwynt was developed in 1998 by Cymdeithas Tai Eryri as a unit that provides 9 beds for young homeless people on the Island.
- The scheme is managed and staffed 24 hours a day by Digartref Cyf.
- Over the years, the scheme has provided a home for many of the Island's young people and has given them an opportunity to improve and flourish.
- As the scheme has been operating for 23 years, the building needs to be upgraded to meet current standards and, due to an increased demand for the service, an opportunity exists to provide 3 additional units which will increase the number of units from 9 to 12.
- The improvements proposed involve investing around £1.1m in the scheme and a £513k Homelessness Prevention grant has been secured from Welsh Government due to the increased demand for this type of service.
- During the 12 months ending 31 March 2021, 84 young people were referred to the service offered by Llys y Gwynt.
- 34 of the 84 individuals were accepted by the scheme. Of the 50 that were not accepted, 12 were refused because the risk of accommodating them was too high, proving that a detailed assessment is undertaken before accepting any young person on the scheme.
- Of the 38 accommodated at Llys y Gwynt during the year in question, 4 were care leavers who had been in the Council's care.
- During the year, there were 11 incidents where the emergency services had to be contacted. 4 because they needed an emergency ambulance, 2 because a child was missing, and 5 due to low-level anti-social behaviour. This incidence rate is low and very similar to the levels seen in general rental flat schemes.

- Anglesey County Council's Director of Social Services and Head of Housing are supportive of this proposal to improve the provision at Llys y Gwynt.

The Planning Enforcement Manager reported that the application is a full application for part demolition works together with alterations and extensions to create 6 additional units as a hostel to provide accommodation and support for young people having 9 bedrooms with occupants sharing a kitchen and communal areas. The proposal entails the reconfiguration of the existing building and the provision of a two storey flat roof extension within an amenity area associated with the hostel. He noted that as part of the statutory consultation as regards to the application a condition has been included as part of any approval of the application that no trees are felled during the construction period. A further condition is to be imposed that obscured glazing be placed on the western elevation of the development so as to protect the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

Councillor Glyn Haynes as a Local Member said that there are concerns by neighbouring properties that insufficient consultation has been undertaken as regards to this development. He also referred that within the Officer's report it states that the Holyhead Town Council has submitted no objection to the application, however the Town Clerk has stated that there was an objection when the application was considered at a recent Town Council meeting. The Chair responded that it would be advisable for the Holyhead Town Council to contact the local planning authority regarding this matter and that the Members of the Committee be afforded with a list of statutory consultees as regards to this application. The Planning Enforcement Manager responded to the comments by the Local Member and said that the statutory consultation process has taken place as there has been representations received as is noted within the report as regards to the requirement for obscured glazing and felling of trees.

Councillor T LI Hughes MBE as a Local Member reiterated the comments by his fellow local member and noted that local concerns have been expressed to the insufficient consultation as regards to this application.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be approved and Councillor Ieuan Williams seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillors Glyn Haynes and T LI Hughes MBE abstained from voting as they considered that insufficient consultation had taken place with the local residents.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions within the written report.**

## **7.2 FPL/2019/338 – Full application for the part removal of the existing concrete sea defence wall and the erection of a replacement sea defence wall in its place on the boundary of Cerrig, Penmon**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of the Local Members. At the meeting held on 7 July, 2021 it was resolved that a site visit was required. A virtual site visit was subsequently carried out on 21 July, 2021. The application was deferred at the meeting held on 28 July, 2021 following the receipt of amended plans which changed the design of the proposed sea wall from a sheet pile reinforced concrete plinth. At the last meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 1 September, 2021 it was resolved to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was deemed that the development would have a detrimental effect on the sensitive area and there is a lack of assurances

as to the side effects in the future of such a development. The development is considered contrary to policies PCYFF 2 and 3 and PS20 of the Joint Local Development Plan.

Councillor Alun Roberts, a Local Member said that his fellow local member, Councillor Gary Pritchard was unable to attend the meeting. Councillor Pritchard was in support of the statement that is to be presented to the meeting. Councillor Roberts said this application is a controversial application and climate change is a factor as is with many planning applications and is a matter that is unavoidable. Natural Resources Wales (NRW) has recently foreseen that rain levels will increase by 20% together with sea levels increasing over the next few years with higher tides and storms will become more apparent. He noted that at the last meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee there were two elements considered as regards to this application – sea wall defence and allowing heavy machinery on the beach to carry out the building work. The Planning Officers have now received a month to consider the issues raised at the last meeting when the application was refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Roberts considered that some elements of the issues raised at the last meeting have not been addressed. He further noted that the sea defence wall will measure 7 metres in width and over 100 metres in length. He considered that creating such a sea defence wall has not been assessed as to the effect on the sea processes in this section on Anglesey. Councillor Roberts further said that it is noted within the amended appendices to the Officer's report that the sea erosion will continue either side of the sea defence. However, there is no mention within the report as to the negative effects of erecting a new sea defence wall. Any intervention of the process of the sea creates a change in the activity of the sea pattern. Linking all of this with climate change it will create problems either side of the sea defences and can effect dwellings on the side of the coasts.

Councillor Roberts referred to allowing heavy machinery on the beach if the application was approved. He considered that the Officer's report did not fully address the detrimental effect on the beach if heavy machinery is allowed on the beach area to carry out the sea defence wall i.e. management of the traffic on the beach, size of the machinery, working hours, tonnage loads allowed, paths on the beach, restoring the beach, timetable to complete the work and accountability. He noted that having read the documentation with the application the information contained is inadequate and it is concerning that it is suggested that some of the works is not required. Councillor Roberts further said that with the introduction of planning policy TAN 15 in the next few weeks, more attention will be given to climate change within the policy; flooding and dangers to the coastline of Wales will be addressed.

Councillor Carwyn Jones, a Local Member said that the erection of the sea defence wall of over 100 metres in length and 7 metres in height along Lleiniog Beach will have a detrimental effect on a sensitive area and will have serious damage as regards to historical Ice Age rock formations at the beach which is of worldwide importance. He noted that GeoMôn's comments as regards to this application has not been received which is imperative in respect of this development due to the geographical sensitivity of the area. The location of the site is within the Conservation Area of the Menai Straits and sensitive area of SSI, Aberlleiniog Fisheries and AONB area. Councillor Jones expressed strongly that once the damage to this sensitive area has occurred it will not be returned to its original state. He said that allowing this application will set a precedent for a number of similar applications in the future and will damage the sea defence of the Island; it will also change the course of nature. He expressed that around 50 residents live near the coastline in the area and approving this application could result in people having to erect a sea defence wall to defend their own properties.

Councillor Carwyn Jones further said that the proposed application is in contrary of the Shore Management Plan. It is noted within the Shore Management Plan that no intervention is to be on the shore of the Menai Straits. He further said that AMG 4 of the Joint Local Development Plan refers 'that coastal development that is detrimental to the environment or the character of the land is unacceptable'. Councillor Jones therefore requested that the Committee reaffirms its previous decision to refuse the application.

The Chief Planning Officer reported that the Officer's report addresses the concerns at the last meeting with regards to the negative and detrimental impact upon the environment and nearby sensitive designations and the adverse side effects upon the nearby coastal area. He noted that further details and mitigation measures in an effort to protect the local environment and designated sites have been submitted by the applicant. These included measures controlling disturbance to wildlife and ecology by managing the storage of materials and plant machinery, surface water, biosecurity, dust, noise, vibrations and spillages. The applicant has proposed monitoring reporting process during pre-construction stage, construction stage and following completion of the works. Monitoring will include the on-site presence of an ecologist, creation of photographic records and topographical surveys. With respect to movement of vehicles across the foreshore, the excavators and dumpers will have low ground pressure tracks or floatation tyres to minimise disturbance to the sand and shingle. All vehicle movement will be restricted to a strip of barren shingle which will be clearly marked. The Chief Planning Officer said that the specialist consultees including NRW, the Authority's Ecologist, CADW together with Gwynedd Archaeology Planning Services (GAPS) have assessed the application and its impact upon the sensitive receptors. All consultees are of the view that given the temporary nature of the construction works together with the mitigation measures being proposed, the works will not have a detrimental impact upon the sensitive area subject to conditions.

The Chief Planning Officer further reported that as regards to the impact of the proposed development upon the adjoining coastline the applicant has provided information that shows that the construction of the sea defence wall will dissipate wave action more effectively hence reducing impacts. NRW do not disagree with this assessment submitted. He noted that officers were of the opinion that the development amounted to the repair and maintenance of the sea defence wall but surmised that the local members appeared to be of the opinion that the nature of the development went beyond this, was significant and was more akin to a new structure. He noted that reference has been made by the Local Members to the Shoreline Management Plan, and given their interpretation of the development it could be argued that due to the policy approach for the area being No Active Intervention (NAI), the proposed development would not accord with the management approach as set out within the Shoreline Management Plan. The Chief Planning Officer referred to the Officer's report as regards NAI policy description for the coastline to the east of Penmon in the Shoreline Management Plan, and reiterated that officers considered that the proposal does not conflict with the intention of the plan.

Councillor John Griffith questioned whether the applicant has formally said that he will restore any damage that occurs to the site if the application is approved. He also referred to the Shoreline Management Plan within the Officer's report and the relevant policies within the Plan. He questioned as to the recommendations of NRW that the applicant discusses the scheme with the Local Authority to change the plan level policy. The Chief Planning Officer responded that the applicant has submitted amended plans outlining that monitoring reporting and mitigation measures will be undertaken to protect the environment. Planning conditions are proposed that will

require these measures to be incorporated into the development and the developer will be expected to comply with requirements. As regards to the Shoreline Management Plan and to the recommendations of NRW that the applicant discusses the scheme to change the plan level policy it is considered that this is a matter for the applicant to pursue separately. He expressed the view that there appears to be a difference of opinion between officers and local members regarding the extent and scope of the works and consequently as to whether the works complied with the Shoreline Management Plan. Councillor Griffith ascertained whether legal opinion has been sought as regards whether such works should be approved on this site. The Legal Services Manager responded that no legal opinion has been sought but he noted that the policies within the Shoreline Management Plan is separate to planning policies.

Councillor K P Hughes said that at the previous meeting he abstained from voting as he required further information as regards to this application. He said that he has read the Officer's report before this meeting the application is for part removal of the existing concrete sea defence wall and the erection of a replacement sea wall to protect the applicant's property. The applicant has submitted a number of mitigation measures to protect the local environment and the professional consultees have responded that the works on the site will not have a detrimental effect within this sensitive area. Councillor K P Hughes proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts said that if the application was to erect a new sea defence wall it would be refused as it did not conform to policies. However, as the application before the Committee was to part replace the sea defence wall and if the foundation of the sea defence wall is not maintained it will collapse due to erosion by the sea. He seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor Ieuan Williams said that he considered that the applicant would be able to maintain the sea defence wall from his own property and he reaffirmed his previous decision to refuse the application.

In the subsequent vote the proposal to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation was carried by 9 votes to 1.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions within the written report.**

### **7.3 HHP/2021/183 – Full application for alterations and extensions together with the erection of a garden room at Dirion Dir, Llangefnï**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At the meeting held on 1 September, 2021 it was resolved to visit the site. A virtual site visit took place on 15 September, 2021.

#### **Public Speakers**

Ms Edwina M Jones, **spoke against the application** and said that she believed that this scheme would create an increase in size, scale and mass that would lead to overdeveloping the site. However, her main concern is the effect on her privacy and that of her neighbour who lives at Glen Ridge. According to the plans submitted, there will be 10 windows on the south-west elevation facing her home at Dolgynfydd, and 3 of them are excessively large in size. This will exacerbate the existing situation, and because of the height of Dirion Dir's ridge and its raised position above Dolgynfydd, using some of these windows would create significant problems as they will overlook her home, and will further erode her privacy. She noted that the video of the site as

was presented to the Site Visit of the site may give the impression that the trees that she has planted in her back garden and those that have been planted at Glen Ridge will provide some privacy, but it must be considered that the trees will lose their leaves in winter and Dirion Dir will be clearly visible from Dolgynydd. Additionally, the effects of climate change could create long-term problems for the leylandii trees at Glen Ridge, and if they are uprooted in a storm, the issue of overlooking from Dirion Dir would increase significantly. Ms Jones further said that the lack of privacy and significant increase in visual impact will cause considerable concerns for her personally and she asked to Committee whether they would be happy to live in Dolgynydd with some of the windows that will be overlooking her property.

Mr Owen Evans, **in support of the application** said that the development is for two small extensions to the property at Dirion Dir with a sunroom and extension to the bedroom on the first floor together with an extension to a dining room. The back extension will not be visible from neighbouring properties as it will be at the corner of the existing building. The distance from Dolgynydd and Glen Ridge comply with the requirements of the SPG as regards to overlooking. The requirement is 21 meters, but both these properties are 33 meters away. The extension to the property at Dirion Dir is not visible from the neighbouring property of Dolgynydd. He noted that reference has been made that the site will be overdevelopment, only a small percentage of the site will be taken up by the sunroom will be taken up but the extension will only be 2.23% of the whole site. The sunroom will be erected on the current patio area, the garden storage is 17.4 meters<sup>2</sup> and the carport is already used as a parking area therefore there is no change to the use. He further said that the high deck over the carport does not create problem for the Ponc y Fron Estate and the other side of the high deck is over open fields. The deck will afford the family an outside seating area as the site at present is surrounded by trees.

The Planning Enforcement Manager reported that the application is for alterations and extensions including a new garden room/store together with a 1<sup>st</sup> floor decking area with glass balustrading to the property. He noted that a letter of objection was received together with a letter on behalf of a neighbour in respect of this application. The main points of objections raised were summarised within the Officer's report to the Committee. The Planning Enforcement Manager further reported that it is considered that the proposal is acceptable within planning terms and the recommendation was one of approval.

Councillor Dylan Rees, a local member said that he was supporting the objections by the neighbouring properties as regards to this application. He said that Ms Edwina M Jones was not against the principle of adaptations proposed at Dirion Dir but was against the submitted application within its context. He noted that reference has been made within the Officer's report and by the supporter of the application that the proposals complies with the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) but these are only guidelines and he referred to Newport City Councils' SPG which refers to similar planning proposals and the overbearing effect on neighbouring properties. Councillor Rees expressed that there is an overbearing effect on the neighbouring properties at Dolgynydd and Glen Ridge and Ms Edwin M Jones has expressed that the proposal would have detrimental negative effect on her property. He further referred to the Officer's report that concludes that 'on balance' it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in land use planning terms and Councillor Rees considered that it was not a definitive recommendation and asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts questioned whether the 'overbearing effects' should be considered in deliberating such a proposal. The Planning Enforcement Manager responded that 'overbearing effects' are considered as regards to planning application

as it has in this instance. He said that the Officer's do not consider that the proposal would have an overbearing effects on the neighbouring properties and it does comply with planning polices and with the SPG adopted by the Authority.

Councillor John Griffith proposed that the application be approved and Councillor Eric W Jones seconded the proposal of approval.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions contained within the written report.**

#### **7.4 FPL/2021/145 – Full application for the siting of 2 shepherd huts at Rhosydd, Brynteg**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a local Member. At the meeting held on 1 September, 2021 it was resolved to visit the site. A virtual site visit took place on 15 September, 2021.

Councillor Margaret M Roberts, a Local Member said that the site is located near an extensive caravan site. She further said that at the virtual site visit the Officer's confirmed that the size of the shepherd huts are a quarter in size of a static caravan and are not visible from the highway. Councillor Roberts asked the Committee to approve this application.

The Planning Enforcement Manager reported the siting of 2 permanent shepherd huts in this open countryside does not conform with planning policies within the Joint Local Development Plan. The recommendation is of refusal of the application.

Councillor John Griffith ascertained the reasons as to the statement within the Officer's report that the proposal does not align with the definitions of a high quality development. The Planning Enforcement Manager responded that the planning policies within the Joint Local Development Plan requires that a higher quality development than erecting 2 shepherds huts in the back garden of a property and it could result in an influx of applications for such developments.

Councillor Ieuan Williams said that he agreed with his fellow local member that the site is near a number of caravan sites and he proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal of approval.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was considered that the proposal complies with policy TWR3 and that the location of the site is near a number of caravan sites.**

***(In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution, the application was automatically deferred to the next meeting to allow Officers the opportunity to prepare a report in respect of the reasons given for approving the application).***

#### **7.5 HHP/2021/157 – Full application for alterations and extensions at The Old Smithy, Marianglas**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a local member. At the meeting held on 1 September, 2021 it was resolved to visit the site. A virtual site visit took place on 15 September, 2021.



Councillor Margaret M Roberts, a Local Member said that she had 'called-in' the application on behalf of the local Community Council as they are objecting to the application. The site location is situated on the prominent Common area in Marianglas and the proposed extension to the dwelling does not conform with the dwellings on either side as they are bungalows and raised the ridge height will be discordant when viewed against other properties in the area and the Old School Building at Marianglas. She further said that approving this application would change the character of the area and would set a precedent for similar extensions.

The Planning Enforcement Manager reported that application is for an extensions to the property and to raise the roof extension to include a dormer window on the front elevation. It is acknowledged that the proposed roof extension will increase the ridge height of the property, but it is considered that the increase in the ridge height is acceptable given the various styles of single and two storey properties in the vicinity. He further said that the proposal is not considered to be detrimental to the character of the area and to neighbouring properties.

Councillor K P Hughes proposed that the application be approved and Councillor R O Jones seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor Ieuan Williams proposed that the application be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation as he considered that the development would be overdevelopment of the site. Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal of refusal as the Community Council has submitted objection to the application.

Following the ensuring vote **it was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions contained within the written report.**

## **8 ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS**

None considered by this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

## **9 AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS**

None considered by this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

## **10 DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS**

None considered by this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

## **11 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS**

None considered by this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

## **12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS**

**12.1 FPL/2021/220 – Full application for the retention of a prefabricated building to be located on the land temporary until March 2022 to house two classrooms and toilets for use by pupils at Canolfan Addysg y Bont, Cildwrn Road, Llangefni**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the land is owned by the Council.

The Chief Planning Officer reported that the application is for the retention of a prefabricated building to be located on the land temporary until March 2022 due to essential extensive maintenance work which is required to be undertaken on the roof of Canolfan Addysg y Bont. He said that Condition 1 of the Officer's report would need to be deleted as the application is for a temporary period only.

Councillor K P Hughes proposed that the application be approved and Councillor Ieuan Williams seconded the proposal.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions contained in the written report and that Condition 1 be deleted.**

#### **12.2 FPL/2021/163 – Full application for alterations and extensions to the existing listed building together with landscaping works at Ucheldre Centre, Holyhead**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the Council is the landowner of part of the site.

The Planning Built and Natural Environment Manager reported that the application is for a side extension to create a shop/lobby, erection of a rear extension so as to create an art workshop, dance studio, storage and changing facilities for the existing Ucheldre Centre listed building, alterations to the existing internal layout together with partial demolition of external walls together with soft and hard landscaping. He noted that it is considered that the extensions will not dominate the existing buildings' character or appearance. It was further noted that amended plans were submitted on 17 September, 2021 and the expiry date for receiving representations will be the 14 October, 2021.

Councillor T LI Hughes MBE proposed that the application be approved and Councillor John Griffiths seconded the proposal.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application and to grant Officer's power to act by approving the application in accordance with the recommendation following the statutory consultation period coming to an end.**

#### **12.3 LBC/2021/24 – Listed Building Consent for part demolition and extensions together with internal and external alterations to the building at Ucheldre Centre, Holyhead**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the Council is the landowner of part of the site.

The Planning Built and Natural Environment Manager reported that the application is for Listed Building Consent for part demolition and extensions to the Ucheldre Centre, Holyhead.

Councillor Eric W Jones proposed that the application be approved and Councillor K P Hughes seconded the proposal of approval.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions contained in the written report.**

#### 12.4 FPL/2021/108 – Full application for conversion of the outbuilding into an affordable dwelling together with alterations and extensions at Fedw Uchaf, Brynrefail, Dulas

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a local Member.

##### ***Public Speaker***

Mr Rhys Davies, **in support of the application**, said that the application is for the conversion of an outbuilding into an affordable dwelling, together with alterations and extensions to create an affordable dwelling with two double bedrooms and one single bedroom – which is no more than is absolutely necessary to meet the family's needs. The key policy here is Policy TAI 7, and this policy permits the use of former agricultural buildings as affordable dwellings. Having said that, not much use is made of this aspect of the policy – as most people's first choice is to convert this type of building for commercial use – usually as holiday units. However, this case is an exception, as the applicant's first choice is to create an affordable dwelling for himself and his family.

The committee report confirms that 5 criteria must be considered under Policy TAI 7:

Firstly, there must be evidence that employment use of the building is not viable. After submitting a pre-application, the applicant was advised to put the building on the market for commercial use. Obviously, he did not wish to sell or rent the building as commercial unit nor a holiday accommodation to comply with the criteria. The building has been marketed on the rental market for approximately a year with 9 enquiries received, but in the end the building and the location were not suitable for anyone. The location was the problem rather than the price. We therefore believe that the first criterion has been met. The committee report states that the marketing information has been reviewed by the Authority's Principal Valuation Officer, who has concluded that the rental price of £700 per month is excessive and unrealistic.

Comparisons are drawn with industrial units in Holyhead – but no mention is made of a comparison with a unit that is more comparable with this building – the old mill in Pencraig, Llangefni. In that case, the Council itself has been marketing the old building, which has a smaller floor space, for a price of £7,500 per annum. The applicant has submitted this evidence as part of the application, but there is no mention of that in the Officer's report. Therefore, it is believed that the marketing process has been completed in an acceptable manner to comply with the policy.

The report confirms that the applicant complies with the second criterion, which is extremely important. He is on the Tai Teg register – he is in need of an affordable dwelling and the applicant also needs to live closer to relatives living in Fedw Uchaf itself, and who require care and support. Clearly, therefore, the applicant complies with this important aspect of the policy and there is confirmation that he is in need of an affordable dwelling and has appropriate local connections to the area.

The report also confirms that the application complies with criterion 3 of the policy and confirms that the building is structurally sound.

Criterion 4 states that no extensive alterations are required to enable the development – and the report states that any addition should not be an aspiration by the applicant to add luxury. In this instance, a house of only 80 metres<sup>2</sup> will be

created, which is reasonable and in line with the size requirements of an affordable dwelling. There is no luxury in this application – only a desire to create a dwelling that can provide a suitable roof over the heads of the applicant and his children.

The Chief Planning Officer reported that the application is for the conversion of an outbuilding into an affordable dwelling together with alterations and extensions. He said that whilst there are planning policies that support developments, the proposal does not meet all the criteria within the relevant policies – TAI 7. Policy TAI 7 relates to the conversion of traditional buildings in the open countryside to residential use if there is evidence that employment use of the building is not viable. Information submitted with the application demonstrates that it has been marketed for commercial use at £700 per calendar month for a period of 12 months. The marketing information has been reviewed and it has been concluded that having regard to the location of the site, the condition of the building and lack of services, the rental valuation is excessive and not realistic. The Chief Planning Officer said that it is also considered that the proposed extension to the building is excessive and unacceptable as it would amount to 74% increase in the floor space of the building. The recommendation is of refusing the application as it does not meet all the necessary criteria.

Councillor Margaret M Roberts, a Local Member said that the proposal is for the conversion of the outbuilding as the applicant is unable to afford a dwelling on the open market as house prices in the area are excessive and unaffordable for the applicant. The applicant also wishes to be near his elderly mother to help on the farm. The planning policies relates that evidence needs to be shown that employment use of the building if not viable. The applicant has marketed the commercial use of the building but the location of the site is unrealistic in the application site. Councillor Roberts asked the Committee to support the application as there is evidence that the applicant needs to support his family in this site.

Councillor Vaughan Hughes, and a Local Members questioned as to the comments by the Officer as regards that the application is excessive and luxurious within its context. He further said that the proposal does conform to most of the planning criteria in this instance. The Chief Planning Officer responded that such adaptations should be kept to an absolute minimum. In this instance the extensions provide for extra living rooms and additional bedrooms. It is considered that building is not adequate to create a dwelling without excessive extensions as has been submitted.

Councillor John Griffith said that he considered that the Committee needs to be consistence in approving such applications and he referred to an application previously refused by the Committee in the Llanddaniel area as it was considered that the proposed extensions were considered excessive to the original building. He said that this proposal will equate to 74% increase to the floor space of the building.

Councillor John Griffith proposed that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Dafydd Roberts seconded the proposal of refusal.

Councillor Ieuan Williams proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation as he considered that each application must be considered within its own merit and the proposal complies with planning policies. Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal of approval.

In the subsequent vote the proposal to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation was carried by 8 votes to 2.

It was **RESOLVED** to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was considered that the proposal complies with policy TAI3, that there is no alternative employment use that has been shown and that the alterations are not extensive.

*(In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution, the application was automatically deferred to the next meeting to allow Officers the opportunity to prepare a report in respect of the reasons given for approving the application).*

**12.5 FPL/2021/106 – Full application for the retention of a wooden hut to accommodate a milk vending machine (Use Class A1) together with hardstanding and parking area, alterations to the existing vehicular access and associated landscaping on land at Neuadd, Cemaes**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a local Member.

Councillor A M Jones, a Local Member requested that a site visit be undertaken in order that the Committee can view the suitability of the site in the village of Cemaes.

Councillor R O Jones, and a Local Member proposed that a site visit be undertaken to view the site. Councillor Robin Williams seconded the proposal.

**It was RESOLVED that a virtual site visit be undertaken in accordance with the Local Members' request.**

**13 OTHER MATTERS**

None were considered by this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

**COUNCILLOR NICOLA ROBERTS  
CHAIR**