

PLANNING AND ORDERS COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2013 at 10.30 a.m. & 2.30 p.m.

- PRESENT:** Councillor W.T. Hughes (Chair)
Councillor Ann Griffith (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors Lewis Davies, Jeffrey M. Evans, John Griffith, K.P. Hughes, T. Victor Hughes, Vaughan Hughes, Raymond Jones, R.O. Jones, Nicola Roberts.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Chief Planning Officer (Item 7.4 only),
Mr. Gary Soloman (Burges Salmon) (Item 7.4 only),
Planning Development Manager (DFJ) (a.m. only),
Planning Assistants,
Chief Engineer (Network)(HP) (Item 14.1),
Senior Engineer (Development Control) (EGJ),
Development Control Officer (Highways) (RE),
Legal Services Manager (RJ),
Committee Officer (MEH),
Administrative Assistant (SC).
- APOLOGIES:** None
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Members: Councillor Bob Parry (applications 7.1, 12.2) (at 10.30 a.m. meeting) ; Councillors T.LI. Hughes, R.LI. Jones and D.R. Thomas (application 7.4)(at 2.30 p.m. meeting).
- Councillor J. Arwel Roberts (Portfolio Holder – Planning).
Councillors R.A. Dew, A.M. Jones, R.M. Jones (p.m. only) and Ieuan Williams

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies are noted above.

2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were made as follows :-

Councillor Raymond Jones in respect of application 7.4 – Local Member.

Councillor John Griffith in respect of application 7.4 (personal interest)

Councillors Lewis Davies, Ann Griffith, John Griffith, Vaughan Hughes and Nicola Roberts declared personal interests on account of the reference to wind turbines within the Plaid Cymru Manifesto but stated that they would consider each application on its own merits.

Councillor J. Arwel Roberts, Portfolio Holder (Planning) although not a Member of the Committee, he declared a personal interest in respect of application 7.3.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 2nd October, 2013 were presented and confirmed as a true record.

4 **SITE VISITS**

The minutes of the Site Visits held on 16th October, 2013 were presented and confirmed as correct.

5 **PUBLIC SPEAKING**

There were public speakers in respect of applications 7.3, 11.1, 12.1, 12.2 and 12.6.

6 **APPLICATIONS THAT WILL BE DEFERRED**

6.1 30C713 – Erection of one 10kw wind turbine with a maximum hub height of up to 15.5m, rotor diameter of up to 7.5m and a maximum upright vertical tip height of up to 19.25m on land at Bryn Mair, Llanbedrgoch

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it has been decided that delegated powers will not be used in connection with wind turbine developments. The Officer's recommendation was that the application be deferred to allow further negotiations to take place.

It was RESOLVED to defer consideration of the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

6.2 35C553A – Outline application for residential development including extra care facility, highway and associated infrastructure at Ty'n Coed, Llangejni

The application was a departure application that Officers were minded to approve. The Officer's recommendation was that the application be deferred to allow further consultations in respect of housing supply figures and education contribution to take place.

It was RESOLVED to defer consideration of the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

6.3 42C114A – Outline application for the erection of an agricultural dwelling together with the installation of a septic tank at Tai'n Coed, Pentraeth

The Officer's recommendation was that the application be deferred to allow for the assessment of additional correspondence received.

It was RESOLVED to defer consideration of the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

6.4 44C294B – Full application for the erection of two 20kW wind turbines with a maximum hub height of 20.5m, a rotor diameter of 13.1m and a maximum vertical upright height of 27.1m on land at Plas Newydd, Rhosybol

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it has been decided that delegated powers will not be used in connection with wind turbine developments. The Officer's recommendation was that the application be deferred to allow for the assessment of additional correspondence received.

It was RESOLVED to defer consideration of the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

7 **APPLICATIONS ARISING**

7.1 16C119B – Full application for the erection of a building to provide a workshop and office at Pen yr Orsedd, Engedi

It was reported that at the meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 2 October, 2013 it was resolved to approve the application contrary to Officer's recommendation as it was considered that it would safeguard and retain employment in the locality and on Anglesey.

Councillor Bob Parry OBE, a Local Member reiterated his support for this application as it is a small workshop for a carpenter. He stated that the applicant's wishes are to be able to work near his home and to employ an apprentice in the future.

Councillor T. Victor Hughes proposed to reaffirm the decision to approve the application and Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal.

It was RESOLVED to reaffirm the decision to approve the application, contrary to the Officer's recommendation, with an additional condition that the workshop and office will be for the applicant's own use as a carpenter.

7.2 39C385D – Full application for the erection of 17 dwellings on land at Lôn Gamfa, Menai Bridge

It was reported that the application is being reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it comprises a departure from the development plan which Officers are minded to approve. The site was visited by the Planning and Orders Committee in January 2013 and by the current Members on the 16 October, 2013.

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

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

7.3 46C147D – Retrospective application for the use of paddock as a touring caravan site and retention of two containers used as a toilet and shower block, the use of land and retention of hardstanding for the commercial storage of caravans, boats and trailers, the residential use of a single touring caravan and retention of portacabin used as an office together with the replacement of the existing septic tank with a new sewerage treatment plant and soakaway at Tan y Graig, Trearddur Bay

It was reported that the application is being reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. The site was visited by the Planning and Orders Committee on 2nd October, 2013.

The Chair invited Mr. Iain Hodgson, an objector to the application, to address the meeting.

The main points raised by Mr. Hodgson were that he had reported this retrospective application 2½ years ago. The access to the site is on a bad bend and a number of accidents have occurred in the vicinity over the years. He was concerned that the Highways Department had not objected to the application.

The Chair invited Mr. Elfed Williams, the agent to the applicant, to address the meeting.

The main points raised by Mr. Williams was the applicant is willing to plant 200 trees as a buffer zone together with widening the access to the site which will allow 2 cars with caravans to pass each other. He agreed that there have been accidents in the vicinity but not in direct association with this site.

Councillor K.P. Hughes proposed that the application be approved and Councillor T. Victor Hughes seconded the proposal.

It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation, subject to the conditions contained within the report, together with an additional condition that the access to the site be widened.

The following item was discussed at the adjourned meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee at 2.30 p.m.

7.4 46C427K/TR/EIA/ECON – A hybrid planning application proposing: Outline with all matters reserved except for means of access, for : A leisure village at Penrhos Coastal Park, London Road, Holyhead comprising: up to 500 new leisure units including new lodges and cottages; Central new hub building comprising reception with leisure facilities including indoor sub-tropical water park, indoor sports hall and cafes, bars, restaurants and retail; Central new Farmer’s Market building; Central new spa and leisure building; A new café and water sports centre at the site of the former Boathouse; Demolition of the Bathing House and the construction of a restaurant at its former location; Demolition of other existing buildings including three agricultural barns and three residential dwellings; Providing and maintaining 29 hectares of publicly accessible areas with public car parking and enhancements to the Coastal Path, including: Managed walkways within 15 hectares of woodland, the retention and enhancement of Grace’s Pond, Lily Pond, Scout’s pond with viewing platforms, the Pet Cemetery, War Memorial, the Pump House and picnic area with bird feeding stations and hides with educational and bilingual interpretation signage created throughout; Creation of a new woodland sculpture trail and boardwalks and enhanced connection to the Coastal Path; the beach will continue to be accessible to the public providing safe access to the shallow shelving water; A Combined Heat and Power Centre Land at Cae Glas: The erection of leisure village accommodation and facilities which have been designed to be used initially as a temporary construction workers accommodation complex for Wylfa B at land at Cae Glas, Parc Cybi, Holyhead comprising : Up to 315 lodges which will be initially sub-divided for nuclear workers accommodation; Central hub building providing reception and canteen ancillary to accommodation; A Park and Ride facility comprising up to 700 car parking spaces; a new hotel; A lakeside hub comprising restaurant, café, retail and bar; New grass football pitch and cricket pitch; and a Combined Heat and Power Centre. To be subsequently converted (post Wylfa B construction) into an extension to the Penrhos Coastal Park Leisure Village comprising: Refurbished lodges and facility buildings to create high quality holiday accommodation (up to 315 family lodges); A Visitor Centre and Nature Reserve allowing controlled public access; and Heritage Centre with visitor parking. Land at Kingsland: the erection of a residential development which has been designed to be used initially as temporary construction workers’ accommodation at land at Kingsland, Kingsland Road, Holyhead comprising: Up to 360 new houses to be initially used as temporary construction workers’ accommodation. To be subsequently converted (post Wylfa B construction) into a residential development comprising: Up to 360 residential dwellings set in high quality landscaping and open spaces. Each phase of development will have ancillary development comprising car parking, servicing areas, open spaces and plant. Full detail for the change of use of the existing Estate building at Penrhos Coastal Park, London Road, Holyhead including the change for :The Bailiffs Tower and outbuildings at Penrhos Home farm from a cricket clubhouse to a visitors’ information centre, restaurant, café, bars and retail; Home Farm Barn and Cart Buildings from farm buildings to cycle and sports hire centre; the Tower from residential to a Manager’s accommodation and ancillary office; and Beddmanarch House from residential to a visitors’ centre – Penrhos Coastal Park, Cae Glas and Kingsland, Holyhead.

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is a major planning application which is a departure from the development plan and is accompanied by an Environment Statement.

Councillor John Griffith declared a personal (but not prejudicial interest) in this application and he remained at the meeting throughout the discussion and voted thereon. Councillor Raymond Jones declared an interest as he is a Local Member but remained at the meeting throughout the discussion. Councillor J. Arwel Roberts although not a member of the Committee also declared a personal interest in the application, but did not make any contribution to the discussions as a Local Member.

Members of the Committee wished it to be recorded that they had been extensively contacted by both parties, which are for and against this development, through social media, e-mails and correspondence.

The Chief Planning Officer introduced Mr. Gary Soloman , a partner of Burges Salmon who have a contract with the Authority to support the Council in respect of certain large developments such as this application. He reported that since the application was refused at the last meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee, it is necessary in accordance with the Council's Constitution and following the 'cooling-off' period, that the application is returned for consideration by the Committee to address the reasons for the refusal. The reasons given for the refusal at the last meeting were that the application was deemed to constitute over development in the countryside and will have a detrimental effect on the AONB. He further stated that additional correspondence had been received from the developer and are attached as Appendix 2, 3 and 4. The report submitted to this Committee highlights the implications of the refusal and related issues such as costs associated with a potential appeal.

The Officer referred to the Applicant's correspondence dated 24 October, 2013 which states that the development will create 465 permanent on site jobs and a further 150 permanent off site jobs. The developer is targeting 90% of these jobs to be filled by Anglesey residents and there will be a S106 obligation to deal with this issue. Local Training will also be given to the local supply chain which is also to be part of the S106 legal agreement. There are also other measures to preserve Penrhos Coastal Park which will include 73 acres of publicly accessible land and woodland; A new visitor centre, public toilets and enhanced public walkways and boardwalks together with a new Public Rights of Way created on the Penrhos Coastal Park; Creation of a 100 acre new Nature Reserve with a visitor centre and car park at Cae Glas; The delivery of 50% affordable houses (up to 160 dwellings) at Kingsland will be made available after the site has been used as temporary nuclear workers accommodation. It was also stated that the applicant has been investing £100k per year for the last 2½ years towards the upkeep of the Penrhos Coastal Park.

He stated that there are 3 elements to this application, Penrhos, Cae Glas and Kingsland which is within one integrated application. Since the last meeting the applicant has stated that the number of houses on the Kingsland site will be reduced from 360 to 320. This may help mitigate the concerns of overdevelopment in the countryside which was stated at the last meeting. A map of the Kingsland site was shown to the Committee. Improvements to the access at Cae Glas has also been put forward by the applicant (no turning to the left along the rural road to Trearddur Bay), the Highways Authority have no objection to this improvement.

The Chief Planning Officer reported in depth on the reasons for refusal of the application at the last meeting :-

Over development in the countryside - Consideration must be given to the context of the Development Plan and the Stopped Unitary Development Plan. The Officer referred to the amendments the Applicant has presented following the last meeting, that 16.5% of the land is to be developed and those areas will include paths and buildings. Most of the site area will be mitigated as land earmarked for landscaping.

Effect on the AONB – Officers highlighted that 90% of the coast of Anglesey is within the AONB. It was noted that measures are in place to protect public access to the areas.

The Officer stressed that if the Penrhos Coastal Park is to be developed, public access to the site will not be restricted. He noted that correspondence received by the department have mentioned that the Penrhos site would have no public access if developed. However, if the application is refused then it is a matter for the landowner to consider the future of the site.

A map showing the Anglesey Aluminium site and surrounding area was shown to the Committee. The Officer indicated areas within the AONB which had either been developed or allocated for development within the Local Plan and Stopped UDP. It was highlighted that there is significant economic reasons for approving the development. The Officer referred to Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 7 – Economic Development which states *'that the planning system would help the economy and employment to grow and should support social sustainability in the context of sustainable development. The Local Planning Authority should aim to support policies and economic development ventures and bring in jobs, houses and employment where is possible, which will reduce the need to travel by car and to bring fiscal regeneration to deprived communities. It is also important for the Authority to understand the economic opportunities that arise from development*

and that the determination process should give the same considerations to this as it does to social and environmental considerations. They should also recognise that economic advantages will sometimes outweigh the social considerations and the environmental considerations. The Planning Authority should deal with economic development applications in a positive and a constructive manner.'

The Officer stressed that he acknowledged that this application was of immense magnitude. He noted that employment is important and he acknowledged that there are strong feelings to conserve the Penrhos Coastal Park from development and the effect of developments on a greenfield site. He stated that the authority will be dealing with large developments in the future and referred to other applications in the area i.e. Biomass Plant on the Anglesey Aluminium site. The generation of over £800 million into this area in the future should be welcomed.

Mr. Gary Soloman, Burges Salmon stated that within the original report submitted to the Planning and Orders Committee at the last meeting, there are a number of proposed legal obligations that the applicants are offering in relation to the development. There are 32 heads of terms which place substantial commitments on the applicant. Page 131 of the Agenda outlined the heads of terms. The key requirements were highlighted in respect of the S106 Legal Agreement as follows :-

- Obligation 1 – 8 require the developer to make a provision or to make a contribution towards the social and community infrastructure which the development places a demand upon, which includes school places, medical care or services, leisure facilities (fitness, sports, swimming, library), police, fire and child social services. A S106 legal agreement will contain a mechanism by which a calculation can occur and the developers will need to pay and make provision in line with that legal obligation.
- Obligation for public access and future maintenance of the areas proposed – various facilities at Penrhos (cricket and football ground), Cae Glas the permissive path along the coastal edge. All these will effectively be dedicated to the public and will need to be maintained. The applicant will have an obligation also to maintain the nature reserve and the visitor centre. Leisure facilities at Penrhos will be required to be open to the public. Compensatory habitat and species enhancement areas will also be contained within the agreement.
- A number of restrictions are proposed which might alleviate some concerns in respect of various strands of the development on Cae Glas and Kingsland. These developments will only come forward for the legacy uses if they are first used for nuclear accommodation. Legal obligations will also be secured to link the Cae Glas and Kingsland sites.
- Local employment obligations and supply chain – a commitment to work with local business and training will be imposed. A financial contribution will also be required to fund local apprenticeship schemes during construction and operation of the development.
- Welsh Language – training to be available to employees in the Welsh language and measures in place to attract and ensure, as far as possible, that local Welsh employees are utilised as part of the development during construction and operation.
- Tourism – suitable collaboration will be required for this development and the various businesses on Anglesey to ensure that it is integrated and not a threat to other facilities on the Island. For example, these businesses to be allowed to display and advertise their facilities within the complex at Penrhos. Therefore, within the S106 Legal Agreement – other business are to be accommodated rather than under threat by this development.
- Legacy uses, Cae Glas & Kingsland – The developer to put monies aside per year post any nuclear workers accommodation development. This would be a protection if the developer became insolvent.

Mr. Soloman further reported on the following :-

Appeal and Costs Issues

If the application was to be refused, the appellants have a right to appeal to Welsh Government. The Council's Constitution requires the Officer's to look at the issue of costs and to assess the costs risks. When a resolution is made against Officer's advice there is always a costs risk factor. There is a Circular advice on costs (Circular 23/93), which was noted at Page 68 of the report, states '..... in any appeal preceding the authority would be expected to produce evidence to

substantiate each reason for refusal. If they cannot do so, costs may be awarded against a planning authority and each reason upon appeal would be examined in respect of evidence and taking into account development plan, circular advice and other material considerations.' Part of the analysis is to look at the conditions and the S106 obligations to see whether they would make the development acceptable. It is impossible to say if costs would be awarded against the Council should the applicant appeal if the Committee were to maintain its refusal of this application, but there is a risk.

Implications of the Decision

He stated that if the application were to go to appeal, the normal position is that each side would have to bear its own costs. There would therefore be a cost implication for the Council in relation to an appeal. It would be open to the applicant to make a costs application if he could show unreasonable behaviour (the report outlines this). There is therefore a risk that the Council would have to bear some or all of the applicant's costs. Costs could run to several hundred thousand pounds.

If the applicant should appeal, the 32 heads of terms could be affected and could result in less planning gain in respect of social, community and infrastructure. Although the Council considers the Heads of Terms to be necessary etc. Welsh Government may disagree or the applicant may no longer be willing to offer all matters currently offered. Mr. Soloman finally noted that Welsh Government could 'call-in' the application at any time.

The Chair invited Councillor R.LI. Jones to address the Committee.

Councillor R.LI. Jones – thanked the Officers for the immense work associated with this application.

Councillor Jones referred to documentation from the Joint Planning Policy Unit (JPPU) and questioned if Members of the Committee has seen these documents. This Authority is working with Gwynedd Council to produce a new Joint Development Plan. JPPU' discussed the issue of the Land and Lakes development at their meeting held around 3 months ago. The JPPU is made up of Ynys Mon and Gwynedd Council's Planning and Economic Officers. Paragraph 11.7 of the documentation states '*... Although the Welsh Assembly Government is trying to promote more building or private houses, the Kingsland site will not yield conventional residential properties which are the focus of the Interim Planning Policy until 2026 at the earliest i.e. 13 years in the future. The development is not considered to accord with the purpose of the policy. It is difficult to argue that the proposal i.e. the houses in Kingsland will accord with the National Planning Policy or Housing Strategy Objectives of boosting the national supply of houses. It is also considered that the need for residential development has not been demonstrated.*' 'Although Horizon has given the development company a without prejudice letter of support, Horizon still reserves the right to explore the various options which are open to them once the construction studies and public consultation has been completed.' Horizon has not signed anything which is binding with the developer of Land and Lakes. Can you imagine what all the hotels, caravan sites, bed and breakfast facilities around Cemaes, Amlwch and Llangefni are going to say when they are told that 800 houses are to be built for workers and presumably each house will accommodate 4 workmen giving 3,200 of the workforce somewhere to sleep. There will be no need for any other accommodation to be provided, Land and Lakes will have provided it all. Are 3,200 workers going to travel backwards and forwards to Holyhead at all times of the day and night? No kitchens are to be provided within the houses, is this serious? Let the Planning Inspectorate look at this and see if he agrees that the workforce needs to live as near as possible to the workplace and to pay as little as possible for their accommodation. Councillor Jones did not consider that these houses are the answer to the workforce needs. There is no reason why the 3 year supply of houses/sites cannot maintain a combination of sites and not within the AONB elsewhere in Holyhead or the other two largest settlements on Anglesey. Paragraph 11.2.1 by JPPU states '*..... it is advisable to consider whether granting permission for the housing development will predetermine the decision about the scale, location or phasing of new developments that is properly to be taken in the Local Joint Development Plan context.*' Paragraph 2.6.3 and 2.6.4 of the PPW provides guidance on this issue which states '*..... References made to the scale of the development are individual or accumulative effect and a stage a plan has reached. In terms of the matter, a Local Development Plan has progressed beyond the predetermined preparation deposit stage and it is anticipated that the deposit stage will be reached by March 2014.*

Allowing this development in advance of this process might prejudice its outcome. This statement has been said to the Officers of Anglesey and Gwynedd, allowing this LDP process, and the pre-deposit stage is March 2014. This could have waited until March next year.

Paragraph 11.28 also asks the same questions about the Leisure Village. 'Are you as a Committee satisfied that alternative sites, further away from the protected landscape where impact would be less significant, have they been fully explored in the search for sites for the leisure uses. If you are not satisfied with this development then further scrutiny should be asked for and to refuse this application.'

Councillor Jones further stated that over 1,200 houses have been granted planning permission or have already been built in Holyhead since 2001. With the additional 360 houses in Kingsland, it makes up to 1,560 houses when the UDP allowed for only 403 to be built. We are therefore looking in excess of 1,157 been given planning permission in the UDP. The Plan, although not adopted, is still being considered to be given weight as it is passed by the Planning Inspectorate. It appears we have not given it any weight at all if we look at these figures. He asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The Chief Planning Officer responded that he has discussed the issues raised by Councillor Jones yesterday. The JPPU has been part of the discussion on this application for 2 ½ years. He stated that Officers do not include every consultation reply and discussions within the report; they précis them. All consultations received and publically available should anyone wish to view them. The Planning Policy comments are included within the context of the report and they do not object based on policy to this application. If they did this could be a reason for the Planning Officers of the Authority to refuse the application. The houses in Kingsland will be used for approximately 8 years by Wylfa Power Station workers, following this period they will then become part of the 5 year land supply. He stated that they acknowledge within the written report that there is no proven housing need in this area in the context of this development. 50% of the units will become affordable after the period and an assessment will be needed on the housing need post Wylfa workers accommodation. Mr. Gary Soloman referred to Page 128 of the Agenda which refers to 'prematurity' in respect of the housing proposal at Kingsland. He stated that it would not be a sustainable ground for refusal of the application for the reasons given.

The Chief Planning Officer further referred to the statement by Councillor Jones in respect of alternative sites for the nuclear workers. He noted that the report to Committee refers that the applicant has considered other sites and have carried out assessment on those sites; the conclusion was that they were not suitable for such scale of a development. He noted that the applicant had stated at the last meeting of this Committee that Horizon is unable to give a letter of confirmation that the houses will be required at Kingsland. Horizon does support the application as it is part of their strategy for workers accommodation. A third of the workers are to be located in tourist's accommodation, third in an individual campus and a third within the private rented sector. These accommodation applications need to be in place ready for the Development Consent Order in respect of Wylfa B. If the Committee refuses this application there is no Plan B. The Nuclear Sector wishes to have workers accommodation with 30 minutes of the site and to be transported backwards and forwards easily.

The Chair invited Councillor Jeff Evans, one of the Local Members to address the meeting.

Councillor Jeff Evans stated that he found it difficult to speak for or against this application. It is very difficult for the Committee too as they will be 'damned if we do or damned if we don't. He said that he has considered the application with honesty, conviction and integrity, having taken the evidence before him; the representations received and what is best the best interest of the community, especially for the youths, unemployed and the economy at large. As a Planning Committee Member, the current rules are that none of the two local Planning Committee Members, or the other 4 Local Members are allowed to vote. Everyone is aware that the economy of Holyhead and Anglesey is in grave difficulties with businesses closing and unemployment extremely high. As a former Manager of the Holyhead Unemployed Workers Centre for 30 years and Youth Leader at the Jess Hughes Centre for 29 years, he was fully aware of the economic issues. He stated that this is why he is stating his support for the Land and Lakes.

He stated his reasons for his support of the Land and Lakes initiative as the Island has high unemployment, with many youths migrating to find employment. They do not want to leave the Island but they don't want to be another unemployment statistic. Many youths who he has worked with have stated that passing GCSE's and A level in the end leaves them having to leave their own town; this is so sad. People on the Island are now forced to having to present themselves to 'food banks' just to have enough to eat. In the mid-sixties people did not want to see Anglesey Aluminium or Wylfa to come on the Island, but they proved to be good employers who ensured effective training, trades and apprentices and gave the workforce good wages. How we would welcome this today. Land and Lakes may not be able to compete in the same manner but in these difficult times, he believes they could assist and contribute to the betterment of many.

The application is for a Leisure Village and associated houses needed for holiday makers but in the first instance supporting housing requirement for the Wylfa development. Though the Leisure Village impacts on the Penrhos Nature Reserve site, he is confident that it is for the better. Anglesey Aluminium owns the site and it costs £250,000 annually for its upkeep; should this venture not go ahead, as it has been confirmed at the top table, the site will still be up for sale and sold potentially preventing any future usage by the public. Land and Lakes have stated that they will enhance the coastal park, making a new public right of way, committing 73 acres of publicly accessed land and woodland. In addition they will create a 100 acre new nature reserve at Cae Glas. Instead of a reduction of access to walks in this area of outstanding beauty, there will be improved access, with well-maintained and enhanced walkways. There will be further access to Leisure Facilities that will be made available and welcomed.

There is a dire situation on Anglesey in respect of unemployment, in the newspapers yesterday the County Council told its 3,000 employees they can apply for redundancy, it is so sad, but this is the environment we are in.

One major query and concern that has been brought to his attention and his compatriots as to employment opportunities at Land and Lakes, will they really be for local people? Will the jobs be of value? Do they pay wages? The jobs at the Leisure Village will be different to those attached to the constructions jobs. Councillor Evans listed the jobs that will be available: 40 general management jobs, 180 posts in lodge/hotel housekeeping, 45 restaurant staff, 25 shop retail staff, 25 health spa/gym staff, 25 water sports/spa outdoor recreational staff, 30 bar staff, 35 reception/hospitality staff, 35 facility/building general housekeeping staff, 6 security staff, 8 landscape staff/nature reserve maintenance staff, 2 medical services staff, 3 coach drivers, 2 mail room/portage, 4 maintenance team. 465 posts which are full time equivalent posts but it would be expected that the number would be greater than this for some of the posts may well be taken up by part-time basis. It is expected that the off-site supply chain will support 150 staff outside. There is a commitment by Land and Lakes to prioritise the jobs for local people; to fund the local training and skills for the jobs and apprenticeships scheme to make sure that adequate training opportunities are offered.

Another contentious issue seems to be the building of the homes for workers housing to be converted later to holiday lodges Kingsland and development at Cae Glas; alas these development are the requirement part of the planning application considered to be complementary to the other planned development 'Wylfa B'. Whether the Land and Lakes development goes ahead, there will be still a requirement to house and facilitate the 3,500 nuclear workers, they will have to be accommodated somewhere and we cannot say 'not in my back yard'. There are various issues concerned with this as Land and Lakes, Horizon and the County Council will have to consider the impact on local services i.e. dentists, doctors, schools, hospitals, and put in place whatever is required to minimize the detrimental effects.

Councillor Evans referred to the Welsh language and stated that he does not speak Welsh, but it is necessary to take what Land and Lakes are saying what they are going to use to Welshness as a selling point, saying 'come to Welsh, come to Holyhead, and experience the Welsh way of life', 'experience the culture and the language'. 11% of the Welsh language has dropped according to the Census figures over the last 10 years. We have to reverse that trend and the way to reverse this is to give our youths the opportunity for employment in the area and not be forced to move out. He stated that he applauded both sides of the debate in respect of this application and the people who have come to the Committee today. He considered that based on the evidence before him he had to vote positively towards this application.

The Chair invited Councillor Raymond Jones to address the Committee.

Councillor Raymond Jones stated that it has become apparent that this application is extremely controversial, probably the most important decision this Committee will have to decide. He stated that he is unable to vote as local member under the rules of the Council. He stated that he is in a conundrum, whether to listen to a few people, who since the last meeting, have been stirred up by certain people in the town who have felt it their duty to make a personal attack on the opposers. He stated that he is aware of this and he himself has been attacked and this has worried him. Without knowing the full facts, the Planning Committee has been called by the pro-Land and Lakes protestors as weak, unprofessional, self-serving and even corrupt. He stated that he had been accused of being corrupt due to the decision last month. Do we listen to the majority of people from the area who have signed petitions, written e-mails, or letters, who are in a strong position to oppose the plans; all for valid reasons?

The decision on this application was not taken lightly and was not an easy one. There are great concerns regarding the development at Cae Glas, Kingsland and Penrhos in its scale. The overall impact on the AONB; the primary objective for designating an AONB is the conservation and the enhancement of their natural beauty. This is our statutory duty given that the Countryside Council for Wales has strong objections and Natural Resources Wales have concerns. This must be a significant factor in this planning decision. We have to judge whether this proposal maximises substantial development by using all the evidence. Looking at this evidence, it is clear that there are flaws in the Officer's report. Firstly, the provision of housing for Wylfa B construction workers, this is given significant weight as a material consideration in the Land and Lakes report. In saying that accommodation will address two concerns; the housing need for future construction workers, but this is only a potential; the future need which may or not proceed. Another concern is more intangible that the lack of provision of temporary accommodation for the workers could delay construction of a future power station. This is highly speculative, and is not central as to whether this application should be permitted. The issue here related to a provision of what Land and Lakes continue to advertise this as a leisure village and permanent housing.

The phasing of the project by the applicant is only if construction of workers accommodation is needed. Will the Kingsland and Cae Glas sites proceed? This is totally inconsistent with the Officer's opinion that this is an integrated proposal; what we have here is a speculative application on 3 greenfield sites, whereby perhaps only 1 of these sites will be developed unless another unconnected part of this project gets the go ahead.

Councillor Jones further stated that he considered that construction workers housing is a 'pie-in-the-sky' and more of this proposal is either harmful or plainly neutral. Some of the impacts are significantly harmful in respect of the development in an AONB with Penrhos and the loss of the landscape, loss of ancient woodland, the impacts on biodiversity and the reduction of open space which has been accessible to the public for over 40 years. These types of impacts cannot be totally mitigated and is a fact that it would constitute harm. Addition 5 of Planning Policy Wales is the most significant planning document in this case as it states: *'where the development plan is outdated [as is the currently the case on Anglesey], the presumption in favour of substantial development should apply'*. So in this circumstance National Policies should be used. That, once all the economic social and environmental factors have been considered, that is when the negative outweighs the positive then a development should not proceed. It is for this reason that the proposal should be refused.

Are we ready as Anglesey County Council to set a new precedence that we can ignore some of our policies, and if this is the case, where does this end? Will we be then opening the floodgates to future applications and disregard more and more of our own policies? If this is the case we might as well rip them up and be done with it. Will we be telling everyone that the Isle of Anglesey County Council known as the Council in Wales who run their Council notable contrary to the Welsh Government's policies that every company that comes here with planning applications can run amok. If we disregard any policies and social issues on this beautiful Island, that is why the Committee got it right the first time and I know they have the integrity to do so again.

The Chief Planning Officer wished to respond to issues raised and stated that it is a duty on the Committee and Officers to consider the application on its merits in respect of the Development Plan

and other planning considerations that can withstand any challenge. He appreciated that there are strong feelings from both sides locally in respect of this application. There is a statutory duty for the Officers to consider fully any development within an AONB which was highlighted in the report to the Committee at the last meeting. He wished to make it clear that Natural Resources Wales do not oppose the application; they had voiced concerns at the beginning but withdrew their opposition following discussions with the Planning Authority and the applicant thereafter in respect of mitigation issues. He stated that the Members have referred that the application was speculative; the application has been submitted as an integrated application with an attachment to the three sites. He referred to the fact that Wylfa B is one of the national sites identified by National Government as potential nuclear new build.

National Policy, paragraph 5.5.6 referred to by Members has been dealt with at the last meeting in respect of the effect of the development on the locality, placing the application on a different site and the effect on the local economy if this application was refused. The Officer stated that this application does not tick all the boxes; it will affect the different planning policies and the Development Plan. Large sites in the area have already been developed or approved i.e. Parc Cybi, Biomass on land identified in the Development Plan and in the Unitary Development Plan. He stressed that the Planning Officers have not breached the Policies as suggested.

The Chair invited Councillor T.LI. Hughes to address the meeting.

Councillor T.LI. Hughes stated that he appreciated the vision of Land and Lakes have had to bring this application to Anglesey. He stated that it has been a difficult few weeks in the town of Holyhead in respect of this application due to high feelings for and against the application. He referred to the social media i.e. Facebook and Twitter and the comments were a disgrace. He stated it is about time the people of Holyhead realised what they are doing and start thinking about the best for the area. Councillor Hughes wished to make it clear that he has no association to the football field that is located on the Anglesey Aluminium site. He stressed that he has not expressed his opinion in respect of this application in the press or publicly.

He considered that the Kingsland development of 320 nuclear workers accommodation and another potential 100 dwellings by another developer will make the Kingsland area similar to a village on its own. 320 nuclear workers accommodation without kitchen facilities and multiple occupation worries him; he questioned if health and safety issues have been address in respect of this matter. He questioned if the applicant would have asked to build the nuclear workers accommodation on its own, would it have been approved? Why won't Land and Lakes wait until the agreement has been signed by Horizon? The land at Kingsland if approved will now be designated as a development site whatever happens. What will happen if the Land and Lakes Company went into liquidation? Who would bear the costs of upgrading the nuclear workers accommodation to dwellings? He believed that Land and Lakes should put a designated sum of money aside in respect of the matter which would be a 100% commitment.

Councillor Hughes questioned if the application was approved and Land and Lakes decided not to carry on with the development, what will happen if another large development company took over the sites? He questioned if sound legal obligations are in place in respect of this matter?

He quoted from the Horizon website that the start of the Wylfa site clearance is June 2015 to March 2018; start of major ground work at Wylfa 2018 onwards; first concrete pour at Wylfa B, June 2020 onwards; Horizon style accommodation construction phase and other projects March 2018; proposed Cae Glas and Kingsland development for nuclear workforce accommodation construction phase June 2018 or earlier. Councillor Hughes said that his main concerns are that there is no agreement with Horizon.

The Chief Planning Officer responded that it was important to understand that each planning application is considered on its own merits. He referred to Councillor Hughes comments regarding the Kingsland site and reminded the Committee that the application is a development incorporating the Penrhos, Kingsland and Cae Glas sites and negotiations with Land and Lakes have been ongoing for over 2½ years. The Company has also address issues of concern. He confirmed that there is support but no formal agreement at present with Horizon for the nuclear works accommodation and if this does not materialize then the Penrhos development will only go ahead.

He reminded the Committee that there is an Interim Planning Policy in place allowing up to 50 units or more to be developed on the outskirts of large towns.

Mr. Gary Soloman confirmed that the S106 will contain binding legal obligations on the applicant and any subsequent land owner. If there is no nuclear workers accommodation and no contract signed, there will be no housing on the site. A separate planning application would be required whoever the landowner is at the time. A funding mechanism will have to be put in place which means that the developer will have to put funds aside from the development at Penrhos to allow, if and when a legacy development occurs, monies to be drawn down by whoever converts the workers accommodation houses if the applicant became insolvent.

The Chair invited Councillor D.R. Thomas to address the meeting.

Councillor D.R. Thomas stated that 4 out of the 6 Local Members are opposed to this application. The local members are aware of the area and landscape together with the local feelings of the community. He referred to the 3 sites in respect of this application. He considered that the Penrhos site is extensive and a quarter or half the size would be more acceptable. The current Penrhos application will destroy the only reason people visit the area to enjoy the wildlife and tranquillity. The Cae Glas site has no legal agreement with Horizon Nuclear Power. He considered that the workers accommodation should be incorporated into other towns on the Island so that they will be able to take advantage/disadvantage in these locations. The Rhosgoch site is also near the proposed Wylfa B site and security would be advantageous near a nuclear site with far less travelling.

His main concerns are the development at Kingsland. The loss of agricultural land is of concern between Holyhead and Trearddur Bay. He considered that it would equate to building a village between the two areas. He referred to planning applications having already been approved in the Holyhead area i.e. Llaingoch and Newry in Holyhead together planning approval for numerous locations in the Trearddur Bay area.

Councillor Thomas stressed that he wants to see employment opportunities on the Island and for people to be able to work through the medium of the Welsh language. However, due to the scale and development of this application, it could bring more problems to future generations.

The Chief Planning Officer responded that extensive consultations have taken place with the applicant to ensure the best development possible at Penrhos to make sure that the lodges are built in the correct locations and landscaping of the highest possible. This development will allow for public access to the area. He said that if this development is refused there are implications for the Penrhos site with the loss of £100k contribution by the developer. There could be no public access to Penrhos what so ever. He followed on to state that the developer has conducted an assessment of various locations in the areas to locate this development but the Company must have a specific site to allow sufficient number of workers to be accommodated.

The Chair invited Members of the Committee to deliberate the application.

Councillor T. Victor Hughes stated that he realised that Penrhos Nature Reserve is private land and thanked Anglesey Aluminium for looking after the site for many years. He stated that he would be extremely happy to see over 400 employment materializing from this development. Naturally young people who are afforded employment near their home will stay on the Island and the Welsh language will be protected. Businesses will also benefit with people spending on the Island. Councillor Hughes expressed that Anglesey is open for business and challenged anybody who did not agree. However, he said that the Penrhos development is so dependent of other elements in the planning application. He questioned if the Penrhos development was a sound application why had e the developer not submitted an application for the Penrhos site on its own. The most important word in a business plan is 'robust'; is the Penrhos development robust enough, is it sustainable? It is obvious that the developer in the way he has act thinks that it is not. If this is untrue, why does the application need to be subsidised in such a way.

The Director of the Land & Lakes Company stated at the last meeting that if Wylfa B is not built, then other elements of the application will not proceed. However, the Company wishes us to approve the whole application. Councillor Hughes considered that this appeared premature to him. He referred

to the Cae Glas site which will be a camp for over 100 nuclear workers which could be an extension to the Penrhos site thereafter. He stated that the pollution of the site will be a problem but the developer has stated that he is happy for part of the site to become a nature reserve following clearance of the site. Councillor Hughes hoped that the estimated cost of this is realistic. The narrow bridge across the A55 between the Cae Glas and Penrhos site is an integral part of the application and is substandard.

Councillor Hughes referred to the Kingsland site which is to be a further development of accommodation for nuclear workers on level fields between Holyhead and Trearddur Bay which is not far from Cae Glas. He considered that this will turn the west of Anglesey into the 'Wild West'; 3,500 of outsiders into the same place. If this is not enough, the developer wishes to turn the Kingsland site into a huge estate of permanent housing. 320 houses in a prime location which nobody would want to see developed; this is a natural buffer between Holyhead and Trearddur Bay. The worth of 320 plots will be a huge sum and the developer wishes to use this as a legacy for developing the Penrhos site. He considered that it would be an insult to the people of Holyhead to approve this application. This development will have an adverse effect on the Welsh language in the area and a blow to the way of life of the residents of Holyhead. He considered that this was an excuse for the developer to have planning permission through the 'back door'. He questioned what will be the effect of small building companies in the area? Already in the Holyhead area 290 planning applications have been approved but only 12 have started. The development at Kingsland will be as big as the Pencraig and Bron-y-Graig estates in Llangefni and half as big as the estates at Morawelon.

He asked his fellow Councillors who voted for this application at the last meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee to think and voice their opinions on the various aspects and elements of this application in the hope that the Welsh Assembly will see how unfair the strategy is behind this application. He asked the Committee to consider if the business case for the Penrhos site is weak, what is to stop the developer from giving up after a short period of time. When the first clod of earth is raised at Wylfa this Kingsland site can be exchanged for money at any time; will there be anything that will stop this? Who will have egg on their faces in the end?

Councillor Hughes said that employment is required on the Island but it is a duty on Members to consider the price to be paid for that. I stated that he found no reason to change his opinion from the last meeting and proposed that the application be refused.

The Chief Planning Officer responded that the issue raised in respect of the effect on the Welsh language has been addressed within the report. He emphasised that the Committee must consider the application as one. He referred to the statement by Councillor Hughes in respect of the effect on small building companies in respect of this application. DU Construction a local building company has written to the Planning Department to express their support for this application.

Councillor K.P. Hughes said that he did not wish to be disrespectful, but he found it hard to understand the attitude of some Councillors in respect of this application. He stated that he has heard so many time Members saying how important it is to teach young people skills on Anglesey to prepare them for work. Young people on the Island are being trained so that they have the skills to offer to future employers. The only thing they need is the opportunity to use those skills to earn a livelihood. The Members had an opportunity at the last meeting to support a project that would have given years of work for the unemployed and young people of the Island. He questioned if the Authority wants to be seen to be able to offer work for young people to stay on the Island and raise families or would they rather put gates on the bridges with a sign saying that the Island is an Island for the elderly and that we don't need work here. Councillor Hughes stated that a message should come from this meeting that the Island is open for business and that the skills are not lost when young people leave the Island. During the period of recession, he considered it was an easy decision and was happy to support the application for the future of the Island which will be more prosperous than it is now.

Councillor R.O. Jones stated that he was not present at the Site Visits in respect of this application and questioned if he was allowed to voice his support for this application. The Legal Services Manager referred to paragraph 4.6.5.12 of the Council's Constitution which states that if the Member is not present at the site visit, he is unable to express his opinion or vote on the application.

Councillor Vaughan Hughes stated that there is 57 miles between Holyhead and the Republic of Ireland who lost 5 million of its population between 1845 and 1850; 1m in the great famine and over a 1m who fled to America and Wales to escape the famine. They came to Wales because there was work; Wales was the cradle of the industrial revolution; this is why the Welsh language is a living language today as Gaelic to some degree has died. He stated that the Island is unable to refuse investment in the area of billions of pounds, that is why he voted in favour of the application at the last meeting and he stated that he would be voting in favour again because, in his opinion, it was a vote for the future of Holyhead and Anglesey.

Councillor Nicola Roberts said that this is a complex application and stated that she thanked people who had contacted her through social media and correspondence in favour and against the application. She stated that she felt under pressure as the documentation were extensive and she did not have adequate time to view the paper work in respect of the Land and Lakes application; this is why she voted to refuse the application at the last meeting. Councillor Roberts wished to make it clear that her decision in respect of this application will be honest and not tied to any political party or any other individuals. She stated that following considering this application fully and listening to the Officers and the public, she considered that Penrhos Nature Reserve cannot be kept as it is and there is no other offer on the table. Councillor Roberts considered that the Authority must grasp this opportunity and will bring much needed employment for the people of Anglesey. She stated that she wishes to see a mix of ages settling on the Island and facilities available for the people of Anglesey. She further stated that she wishes to see the Welsh language thrive and stated her support for this application to allow young people to stay on the Island.

Councillor Ann Griffith said that she voted against this application at the last Planning and Orders Committee. She stated that she had come to today's meeting with an open mind and has listened to the Officer's report and the arguments for and against the application. Councillor Griffith said that she has felt extreme pressure to return to today's meeting and to change her opinion. The pressure started the minute she left the Chamber last month from social media and correspondence. The Officers have responded to the two reasons for refusal at the last meeting i.e. (1) over development in the countryside and (2) the effect on the AONB. She referred to TAN 20; TAN gives guidance on Welsh language matters should be dealt with by local Planning Authorities, these matters should be considered when decisions and applications are discussed. She considered that there has been a lack of consideration to sustainability on the Welsh language in the nearby wards and the rest of the Island. There has been a substantial decrease in the number of people who speak Welsh in Holyhead and the rest of the Island since the 2001 census figures. Councillor Griffith believed that this development would have a detrimental effect on the Welsh language on Anglesey.

She referred to the issue of over development in the countryside, and stated that the social effect of having 3,000 workers, no doubt from other countries in Europe, living in the area. She stated that she was not satisfied that there has been adequate consultation with Social Services locally or in other locations where there has been extensive development i.e. Pembrokeshire and London during the Olympics.

Councillor Ann Griffith referred to the adverse effect on the AONB. The National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949 provided a statutory duty on local authorities to create areas of outstanding beauty, there are just 6 in Wales. There is no National Park on Anglesey, but the areas designated as Anglesey AONB is in effect our National Park. An AONB is an outstanding landscape whose distinctive character and natural beauty are so precious that it is in the nation's interest to safeguard them. This proposed development is the biggest disregard to any AONB in England and Wales that has ever been. She said 'could you imagine this development allowed in the Snowdonia National Park'. This indicates how extreme this proposal development is. The 3 sites at Kingsland, Cae Glas and Penrhos are all within the AONB. The Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 requires all local authorities to have regard to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty AONB's when performing their function. Officers have highlighted paragraph 5.5.5, 'the statutory designation does not necessarily prohibit development but proposal for development must be carefully assessed for their effect on those natural heritage interests which the designations intended to protect'. Officers have also highlighted the tests for major developments which are more national rather than local in character. Paragraphs 5.5.6 says that it is demonstrated to be an overriding public need and a refusal would be severely detrimental to the local economy and there is

no potential for locating the development elsewhere or meeting the need in some other way. The Westminster Government has yet to give the go ahead for Wylfa 'B'; it is 6th in the list of the nuclear power stations after Hinkley Point. She stated that it has been recently witnessed the length and difficulties the Chancellor had in identifying foreign investments to pay the bill for Hinkley Point. There is no overriding public need, the permanent or temporary accommodation on the scale proposed to house over 3,000 construction workers in Holyhead. There may be a potential need if Wylfa B is eventually given the go ahead, in this event there are other brownfield sites on Anglesey that would be suitable, notably part of Cae Glas on the old Anglesey Aluminium site and Rhosgoch. She stated that she opposed this application.

The Chief Planning Officer sympathised with the two last speakers who have stated that there has been extreme pressure on them. He noted that it was up to the Authority how it should deal with such pressures on both elected members and Officers in respect of such applications due to the strong feelings in the local community which are for and against this application. He referred to TAN 20 mentioned by the last speaker and stated that a new TAN 20 has been published since the last meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee, but in the Officers opinion it refers to preparing development plans. Its provisions are premature in that the Authority will not have an adopted LDP until June 2016. He referred to the fact that account had been taken as regard to the application of the Council's SPG on Welsh Language and relevant current Development Plan policies.

Councillor John Griffith asked questions of the Officers in respect of the Biomass Plant at Holyhead and the 600 jobs it will create. He asked when this development was likely to start. The Chief Planning Officer responded that an application has been submitted to DECC for a variation of conditions to the extant consent granted in 2011. This will allow them to submit a design which is more acceptable and use less Biomass material etc. Councillor Griffith questioned if there was anyway the Land and Lakes application could be split into 3 individual applications? The Officers responded that the application needs to be considered as one application.

Councillor Griffith stated that there is a television advert at present which states that 'if there is no home for nature, there will be no nature'; the same can be said for AONB's on Anglesey. The decision taken at this meeting it will have to be considered what legacy is left for future generations. The town of Holyhead is unlikely to be a hotspot in North Wales for tourist. However, what it has is a coast with wildlife habitat and archaeological/historical sites of significance. If the Kingsland and Cae Glas development does not go ahead for nuclear power workers, it should be withdrawn immediately and any separate application be considered as a standalone individual application.

He considered that the approval of all 3 sites as one single application is morally and fundamentally wrong. The application is totally unrealistic in the manner of its presentation. Putting the Penrhos development to one side, the question raised is that what would the decision have been at Cae Glas and Kingsland sites had it been only to erect nuclear workers accommodation and ancillary services. As an AONB location it would inevitably be rejected. However, the developers have stated that if Wylfa is not proceeded with, then it would abandon all plans to develop these sites other than providing a cricket, football pitches and nature reserve at Cae Glas. If the workers accommodation was disregarded there is no realistic correlation between Penrhos and the other sites especially Kingsland which is some way distant. He failed to understand the reasoning of the developer by including Cae Glas and Kingsland and also adding that they will not go ahead with their plans for Cae Glas and Kingsland if Wylfa does not transpire. There is no justification in considering them for approval and would expect the Welsh Inspectorate to seriously consider this issue and reject it. Does the Land and Lakes agreement confirm that they are contractually bound to take the offer of Wylfa workers accommodation, simply no. It is an agreement that they will consider such an option no more.

Councillor Griffith continued to state that he is aware that on Anglesey they are continuing to look at alternative options to support the proposed Wylfa workforce in identifying suitable empty properties, holiday lets, bed and breakfast accommodation from all parts of the Island and this would spread the workforce over a wider area and would not put pressure on local services. Horizon will inevitably look for some campus accommodation but probably at a site nearer Wylfa. Welsh Water originally objected to the application in order to prevent hydraulic overload of sewerage systems and to protect health and safety of existing residents and ensure no detrimental effect to the environment, but at

the last meeting they had changed their minds. They no longer objected provided that the sewerage system is upgraded, but at what costs, several million pounds no doubt.

He stated that he did not object in principle to development which will bring significant employment to Anglesey. He said that he could accept one site but not three. Providing a camp for nuclear workers is a secondary issue and should have been submitted at a separate issue. The Cae Glas and Kingsland sites weaken the case for approval tremendously. However, serious consideration needs to be given if there is no work for young people on Anglesey. The cost associated with an appeal it may cost the Authority thousands of pounds. Councillor Griffith was sad to have to say that he might find himself having to support the application.

Councillor Lewis Davies stated that Members should consider the case on its merit and not be influenced by Officers, the large company nor people who have personal interests in the application. Extreme pressure has been put on Members to reconsider their decision following refusal of the application at the last meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee. He stated that he has given in-depth consideration to the application with an open mind and impartially. He has also look at the application in respect of the advantages and disadvantages economically, linguistically and environmentally. As an elected Member he considered that he has been under pressure to approve this application which is a 500 acre development and within an AONB location. An AONB is statutory protected similar to the National Parks i.e. Snowdonia National Park. Councillor Davies stated that he has consulted with the AONB Services through Wales and they have stated that no such development has ever been approved in an AONB area; why is Anglesey different?

He stated that he did not object to the whole application but felt strongly that this development should have been split into 3 different applications. He has consulted with a number of Planning Officer at different authorities and they have questioned why the 3 sites should be considered as one application. Councillor Davies questioned if Anglesey Planning Authority is different from the other local authorities. He further noted that a number of people from Holyhead have stated that the Land and Lakes Company has been working closely with a social enterprise which is funded by the Welsh Government; it is totally unfair that local residents are put under pressure.

Councillor Davies continued to express that there are no assurances that Wylfa B will be approved and questioned if there was a need for so many houses for workers in one location that can arise to social problems. The Penrhos Nature Reserve attracts over 100,000 people every year and with investments this could be doubled. It attracts the elderly, young and disabled to enjoy the peace and tranquillity.

The 3 sites as one application is not acceptable; it will have detrimental effect on AONB and on historical and scientific sites. The effect on the amenities of the public will put pressure on the Health Authority, social services, and breaches on the law, sewerage systems and on the Welsh Language will be immense. The application is contrary to 11 National and Local Policies and Councillor Davies read out the policies to the Committee. Councillor Davies stated that he objected to the application as it was dealing with 3 sites.

Councillor Davies said that he had many questions to the Officers. He questioned if the Members are encouraged to breach 11 National & Local Policies or are they been adapted to give permission? Has a housing survey been undertaken in the north of the Island? How many houses are for sale in the Holyhead area? How many planning applications has been approved but not developed on Anglesey? How many planning approval has been given on Holy Island? Has a survey been undertaken on the effect on social, health and education in relation to such a development on the Island? Has a sufficient and robust effect on the Welsh language taken in respect of this development? Has public consultation been undertaken with the local Town/Community Council in respect of the scale of the development? Is there any purpose in having an AONB to protect the landscape which is similar to the National Parks? Wind turbine development in the AONB would not be allowed within the Lleyn Peninsula but you want to develop over 500 acres in this location? Is the sewage system at Parc Cybi up to standard to cope with this development? Has a 100 year flood survey been undertaken in respect of this development? The Kingsland development will get rid of the green wedge and create a ribbon development between Kingsland and Trearddur Bay, why is the policy been disregarded?

The Chief Planning Officer responded that all the answers to the questions raised by Councillor Davies were not available. He stated that if he had known of the questions beforehand he would have made provisions. However, he was aware of the Blue Stone development in the Pembroke Park which is large in scale. He stated that he did not accept that Officers had put pressure on the elected Members as this is the only opportunity he has had since the last meeting to discuss the application with the Committee. He emphasised that Mr. Gary Soloman from Burges Salmon had been employed to help the Council ensure the application has been dealt with properly.

Councillor Kenneth P. Hughes proposed that the application be approved and Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lewis Davies proposed to reaffirm the decision to refuse the application and Councillor T. Victor Hughes seconded the proposal.

The voting was as follows :-

To reaffirm the decision to refuse the application : Councillors Lewis Davies, Ann Griffith, T. Victor Hughes. **TOTAL 3**

To approve the application : Councillors John Griffith, Kenneth P. Hughes, Vaughan Hughes, W.T. Hughes, Nicola Roberts. **TOTAL 5**

It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and to note that the application will be referred to the Welsh Government for a period of 21 days in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (Notification)(Wales) Direction 2012 with a recommendation that the local planning authority are minded to permit the planning application subject to :-

- **The applicant entering into a Section 106 Agreement, the draft heads of terms of which are set out in the Original Report.**
- **Planning conditions covering the matters set out in the Original Report.**

That the Head of Planning Services be granted delegated authority to negotiate the terms of the Section 106 Agreement and deal with the matters noted above by condition or Section 106 as is considered appropriate by the Head of Planning Services.

8 ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS

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

9 AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS

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

10 DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS

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

11 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

11.1 45C438 – Outline application with some matters reserved for the erection of a dwelling, the construction of a vehicular access together with the installation of a septic tank on land adjacent to Bryn Gwyn, Newborough

The application was brought to the Committee as the applicant is related to a relevant officer. The application has been scrutinised by the Monitoring Officer as required under paragraph 4.6.10.4 of the Constitution.

It was noted that Councillor P. Rogers, a Local Member requested that the application be deferred as the applicant was unable to attend the meeting.

Councillor John Griffith proposed that the application be deferred and Councillor R.O. Jones seconded the proposal.

It was RESOLVED to defer the application in accordance with the request of a Local Member.

12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS

12.1 10C118A/RE – Full application for the siting of a 15MW solar array farm on land adjacent to Bryn yr Odyn, Soar

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member.

The Vice-Chair, Councillor Ann Griffith, a Local Member requested that the application be visited as a landscape assessment is required and there is a solar array farm only 1.6 km from the site which has had approval; a cumulative effect needs to be assessed.

Councillor K.P. Hughes proposed that the site be visited and Councillor Nicola Roberts seconded the proposal.

It was RESOLVED to undertake a site visit for the reasons given.

12.2 14C135A – Full application for the erection of a dwelling and private garage, creation of a new vehicular access together with the installation of a package treatment plant on land adjacent to Glasfryn, Tyn Lon

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member.

The Chair invited Mrs. Angharad Crump, the applicant, to address the Committee

The main points raised by Mrs. Crump was that the application should be approved under Policy 50 and HP5 which allows individual dwellings on infill sites, close to the development part of small villages and rural cluster; with Llynfaes already identified. As a family they wish to build a home in their local community and near their family. Planning Policy Officers have stated that the plot is part of a rural cluster in the Temporary Planning Policy for Rural Clusters. The current access is used by agricultural machinery, cars and business traffic with no accidents reported in the last 20 years. As applicants they are willing to cut down the trees on the site to allow better visibility.

The Chair invited Councillor Bob Parry OBE, one of the local members to address the Committee.

Councillor Parry stated that he support this application, he questioned the Highways Officers in respect of the issues raised by Mrs. Crump in respect of the access to the site. The Highways Officers responded that they accept that to the access to the site is used by other vehicles but it is substandard. A pre-application meeting had been conducted regarding a new access to the dwelling but the Highways Officers were of the opinion that it would be unacceptable.

Councillor T. Victor Hughes proposed that the application be approved, contrary to the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal.

Councillors Lewis Davies, Ann Griffith, John Griffith, T. Victor Hughes, Vaughan Hughes, R.O. Jones voted in favour of the application. Councillor Jeff Evans abstained from voting.

It was RESOLVED to approve the application, contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the basis that it conforms with Policy 50, as it is within a cluster. (Councillor N. Roberts as a Local Member did not vote on the application).

In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution the application will be automatically deferred to the next meeting to allow the Officers to respond to the reason given for approving the application.

12.3 14C28G/1/ECON – Full application for the erection of a HGV repair workshop together with the siting of a portable office and the provision of HGV parking for agri-contractors on plot 7 at Mona Industrial Park

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

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

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

12.4 14C28H/1/ECON – Full application for the erection of a storage distribution warehouse with office and canteen at Plot 14, Mona Industrial Estate, Mona

It was reported that at the time of submitting the application the land was owned by the County Council. Since submitting the application the applicant has purchased the land.

Councillor Lewis Davies proposed that the application be approved and Councillor R.O. Jones seconded the proposal.

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

12.5 19C1052C – Full application for the erection of 12 two bedroomed flats and 3 one bed roomed flats together with the construction of a new access on the site of the former RNA Club, St. David's Road, Holyhead

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member.

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

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

12.6 28C483 – Full application for the siting of a log cabin at Sea Forth, Warren Road, Rhosneigr

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member.

The Chair invited Mr. Ian Robinson, an objector to the application, to address the Committee.

Mr. Robinson stated that he had been asked by some of the residents of Warren Road, Rhosneigr to address the Committee. He asked the Committee to consider visiting the site in order to view the proposed development.

Councillor Raymond Jones proposed that the site be visited and Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal.

It was RESOLVED to undertake a site visit for the reasons given.

12.7 40C315B – Full application for the temporary permission for the siting of four storage containers on land at Moelfre Seawatch Centre, Moelfre

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the development involves land which the County Council has leased to the RNLI with a term of over 80 years.

Councillor T. Victor Hughes proposed that the application be approved and Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal.

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

13 OTHER MATTERS

13.1 34C40Z/EIA/ECON – Erection of a new Biomass Energy Plant comprising of a wood pellet plant, a biomass combined heat power plant, debarking and chipping plant, wood storage yard and construction of a new vehicle access on land adjacent to Peboc, Industrial Estate, Llangejni

It was RESOLVED to note the report for information and to agree not to contest the two reasons for refusal as mentioned in the report.

13.2 38C267B – Full application for the erection of two 20kW wind turbines with a maximum hub height of up to 20.5m, rotor diameter of up to 13.1m and a maximum upright vertical tip height of up to 27.1m and associated works on land at Clegyrog Uchaf, Carreglefn

It was RESOLVED to note the report for information and to agree to the Officers defending the appeal on the grounds stated in the report.

13.3 38C292C – Full application for the erection of one 500kW wind turbine with a maximum hub height of up to 50 meters, rotor diameter of up to 58 meters and a maximum upright vertical tip height of up to 79 meters, together with associated electrical infrastructure, grid connection and improvements to the existing vehicular access and new access tracks on land at Rhosbeirio Farm, Rhosgoch

It was RESOLVED to note the report for information and to agree to the Officers defending the appeal on the grounds stated in the report.

14 ORDERS

14.1 Isle of Anglesey County Council (Off Street Parking Places) (Various Car Parks Anglesey)(1) Order 2013

Submitted – a report in relation to objections received following advertising the proposed Off-Street Parking Places Order.

Members considered that an Impact Assessment report needs to be carried out before this Committee can consider the report.

It was RESOLVED to defer the report.

**COUNCILLOR W.T. HUGHES
CHAIR**