

# PLANNING AND ORDERS COMMITTEE

## Minutes of the meeting held on 6 June, 2012

- PRESENT:** Councillor J.Arwel Roberts (Chair)  
Councillor W.T.Hughes (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors W.J.Chorlton, E.G.Davies, Lewis Davies, Richard A.Dew, Jim Evans, Kenneth Hughes, R.L.Owen, Clive McGregor, Eric Roberts, Hefin Thomas
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Planning Development Manager  
Planning Assistant  
Planning Assistant  
Planning Assistant (MG)
- Legal Services Manager (RJ)  
Committee Officer (ATH)
- APOLOGIES:** None
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Members: Councillors R.Llewelyn Jones and J.V.Owen (for application 7.1) Derlwyn Hughes (for Application 7.2), Eric Jones (for Application 7.4), Aled Morris Jones (for application 12.2), Ieuan Williams (for application 12.3), Robert Lloyd Hughes (for application 12.4)
- 

The Chair welcomed all those present to this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee and introduced himself, the Vice-Chair and the Officers in attendance.

### 1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

### 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were received and recorded under the respective items

### 3 MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meetings of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 2 May, 2012 and 18 May, 2012 were presented and confirmed as correct.

Arising on the minutes of the 2 May meeting –

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee with reference to application 7.4 – 44C290A for the erection of two wind turbines of the dimensions as noted on land at Bodneathior, Llandyfrydog regarding which power to approve had been delegated to the Officers subject to conducting an assessment on the written statement by the applicant in respect of the intended route for the delivery of the wind turbines and dealing with any representations that may arise therefrom, that an appeal had been lodged prior to the conclusion of that process. A report would be made to the Committee's next meeting. Members noted the information.

### 4 SITE VISITS

The minutes of the site visit held on 16 May, 2012, were presented and confirmed as a correct record.

## 5 PUBLIC SPEAKING

The Chair reported that there would be public speakers in respect of application 7.1 on the agenda.

## 6 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

There were none to be considered at this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

## 7 APPLICATIONS ARISING

### **7.1 19C1046A/EIA/ECON – Outline application for a mixed-use development consisting of a new marina, residential properties, a hotel, commercial, leisure and retail uses together with associated land reclamation and service infrastructure at Holyhead Waterfront, Holyhead**

*Councillor E.G.Davies declared an interest in this application and withdrew from the meeting during the discussion thereon. Councillor R.Llewelyn Jones declared an interest in the application but addressed the Committee in his capacity as Local Member. Councillor J.Arwel Roberts declared a prejudicial interest in the application but having taken advice from the Legal Services Manager he availed himself of the exemption in the Code which allows a Member with such an interest to make representations in cases where the public have a right also. Having made his representations he withdrew from the meeting and remained outside the Chamber for the remainder of the discussion and the vote. The Vice-Chair took the Chair for this item.*

The application was presented to the Committee as it is accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment and is a departure from the development plan which the recommendation is one to approve the proposal.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application above is a very substantial application in the context of Holyhead and indeed, the Isle of Anglesey, and that there are multiple aspects to the application encompassing a new 500 berth marina; 326 new dwellings, parking spaces, retail, commercial and leisure units; maritime museum, workshops, and visitor centre. The Committee has previously visited the site of the application. In terms of the principal elements it is possible to divide the application into distinct development zones, namely Zone 1 comprising of the Marina and Promenade within the eastern section of the development boundary; Zone 2 comprising of Porth y Felin, and Zone 3 comprising of Soldiers Point and the Great Breakwater. The Officer described the different zones and how the various elements of the proposed development would sit within the zones by reference to the site map. He explained that the report seeks to distil what are considered to be the main issues in respect of the application as follows:

- Whether the principle of development is acceptable in terms of policy terms and guidelines. The report comes to the conclusion that the development is acceptable in terms of national, regional and also local policy terms, although it also points out that there are a number of issues which require the submission of further information to demonstrate full compliance with a number of planning policy criteria. It is believed that these are matters of detail which appear capable of resolution.
- Issues arising from the scale and nature of the marina and the related mixed uses. The report comes to the conclusion that whilst elements of the proposal (housing and retail) raise a degree of conflict with some local policy criteria, the conflict is not considered to be significant and any concerns can be dealt with by appropriate planning conditions.
- Whether the proposal has an acceptable environmental impact. The report addresses the primary environmental impacts under the headings in the Environmental Statement along with the consultation response of the most relevant consultees. The Officer's conclusion is that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its environmental impact. Whilst there are a number of issues which require the submission of further information, these are matters of detail which appear capable of resolution during the period within which detailed negotiation would take place in relation to the Head of Terms of the Legal Obligation.

In summary, the Officer said that he was of the opinion that the application can be supported within the general policy context. He referred to the fact that from all the statutory consultees the only body to raise objections to the proposal was the Countryside Council for Wales for reasons as documented in the report the main being the visual and landscape impact. He informed the

Committee that CCW had confirmed via e-mail that morning that it still has concerns regarding those aspects of the proposed development. However as the report testifies, the Officers have carefully evaluated this aspect of the proposal and are satisfied with it. The Environmental Statement accompanying the application does note the principal effects of the development along with the proposed mitigating measures; the Officers have considered those carefully and have consulted widely with the appropriate statutory consultees and have concluded that it is possible to address any effects at detailed design stage and through the imposition of conditions. It is therefore recommended that the outline application be approved and that a Section 106 Agreement is attached to any planning consent given with the following heads of terms –

- That the developer makes provision for affordable housing
- That the developer makes a contribution towards the administration of a local Liaison Committee during the construction period of the development
- That the developer creates physical linkages and enhancements between the waterfront and the town centre so that pedestrians and cyclists can move easily between the two
- That the developer provides off-site mitigation in respect of habitat creation and visitor management

The Officer pointed out that in addition, it is proposed that a number of other planning conditions are attached to permission as set out in the report. He concluded by saying that the Officers have considered the application closely and carefully and whilst they recognise that certain elements of the development are contentious and they are aware of the strong feelings locally in Holyhead and beyond in respect of the proposal, the opinion and recommendation is that on balance, the application is approved.

The Legal Services Manager advised that the proposal has been denoted as a departure from the development plan and as such the Committee should be looking for strong, appropriate and sound reasons to outweigh that fact. He said that he had considered the Officer's report and he did have a concern as to whether the arguments as set out in the report have been presented in a sufficiently robust way to justify the recommendation of approval in this case. He could not go so far as to say the recommendation was incorrect as that would be overstating the position, but that he was concerned that should the Committee accept the recommendation of approval, whether the justification for the recommendation in the report in terms of the argument for affordable housing and retail uses etc. emerges strongly enough to override what the development plan says regarding planning policy. It was a matter for the Committee to assess during the course of the debate and having itself considered the report.

The Chair invited Mr Eilian Williams, as representative of Newry Beach Residents' Association to address the Committee.

Mr Eilian Williams thanked the Committee for the opportunity to speak to the Members. He confirmed that he was present at the meeting to represent the body of objectors to the proposal, over 300 of whom had submitted letters of objection and 4,600 of whom were signatories to petitions opposing the application. He said that it was not fair to describe those just as people who were concerned about the effects of the proposal on the view from their homes. People have a right to express their opinions regarding something which due to its nature is an environmental concern, and this was such a case. Put simply, the reason why - is that the proposal is far too large, and that in most likelihood, is the main contention. He said that he did not believe that people were so concerned by the prospect of a hotel or anchorage or by plans in Porth y Felin: but this would devour the seafront - the town's main environmental asset – and would do so in the interest of private profit. That was unacceptable. He proceeded to say that at any given period there are between 500 and 700 houses for sale in Holyhead; if the intention is to add to these then there is an economic impact arising from the proposal. There is also an impact on the housing market. Moreover, no plans have been presented at this time which make mention of affordable housing and the proposal goes way beyond the plans in relation to local need. Mr Williams said he would have liked to have seen an economic impact assessment of the proposal being carried out. The proposal loosely refers to the creation of 300 jobs as part of the development. That remains to be seen given that time after time developers play the economic card. However he wished to see how many apprenticeships and how many permanent jobs would be created beyond those for cleaners and grass cutters. What was required were jobs of

substance and he emphasised that the quality of the jobs created is as important as the number of jobs. In conclusion that is a summary of the main concerns and it has to be stressed that people are not objecting for the sake of it but because there are items of significant concerns arising from this proposal. People are not prepared to see the beach being swallowed up for the sake of a single development.

There were no questions to Mr Williams from Members of the Committee.

The Chair then invited Mr David M.Jones as agent for the applicant to address the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Jones pointed out that the planning application submitted by Conygar Stenaline is in outline form only with all matters reserved. He said that it was an unfortunate consequence of the Environmental Assessment process that quite detailed drawings have to be produced in order to undertake the environmental assessment exercise – it was unfortunate because many stakeholders both statutory and community can then lose track of the outline nature of the application and focus too much on the drawings presented rather than on the principles behind them. On behalf of Conygar Stenaline he assured Members that in advance of preparing the detailed proposals there would be extensive consultation with the local community to ensure that the opinions of local people are taken into consideration. Mr Jones explained that in order to move forward and to continue investing in this project, his client did require the comfort of securing an outline planning permission from the County Council. As regards conceptual design matters, in order to avoid any misunderstanding going forwards there were a few points he wanted to emphasise. Firstly, public accessibility is a design priority of the scheme. The development will not become a gated community in any respect with the only areas not accessible to the general public being the pontoon within the marina where private boats would be moored. Every effort will be made to encourage public permeability throughout the scheme and reinforce existing infrastructure links to the town centre. Secondly, the new breakwater proposed park and marina complex have been very carefully considered in design terms and have been deliberately configured to provide optimum wave protection to the marina basin. Whilst clearly this is a design objective for the waterfront project the technical studies also show that introducing a physical structure in this location will have beneficial effects on the wave climate at the existing Holyhead marina. Mr Jones proceeded to say that there was no escaping the fact that the effects of the proposed development will be significant in landscape and visual terms. However, whether these effects are adverse or beneficial he would contend, is a matter of personal opinion. The developer is confident that with considerate and sympathetic design the project can serve to enhance this part of the Holyhead coastline. In approving the application, on top of economic regeneration the County Council can also secure a number of other benefits for Holyhead through Section 106 commitments which would include the transfer of the green areas either side of beach road to ensure these are never developed together with a financial contribution towards the maintenance costs; windfall affordable housing – and it must be noted that Conygar Stenaline is not against the idea of on site provision of affordable homes; a financial contribution towards the running costs of Breakwater Country Park and the future safeguarding of the great breakwater. The Waterfront scheme would benefit from the shelter this structure provides and Conygar Stenaline is committed to ensuring that this historic feature continues to survive the test of time. In conclusion, Mr Jones said the proposal represents a unique opportunity for Holyhead to benefit from millions of pounds of private investment. Conygar Stenaline is very keen to deliver the project as long as it has the support of the town and the County Council. If that support is not forthcoming and the application is refused, then the company will respect that democratic decision, will close its files and make its investment elsewhere. Mr Jones closed by saying that with that in mind, he urged the Committee to support the Holyhead Town Council's decision to embrace this opportunity and to endorse the Officer's recommendation of approval.

Members of the Committee were given the opportunity to question Mr David Jones on his submission. Councillor Jim Evans asked whether Mr Jones could elaborate on the employment opportunities the development was projected to create. Mr Jones explained in reply that the employment associated with any development separates into two parts, the one the permanent employment and the other the secondary employment generated throughout the construction phase. As regards permanent employment, that divides into those jobs directly associated with

the development i.e. the operational staff required to serve the marina and hotel. He said that there would be cleaners but that those jobs were still jobs. The retail facilities, whilst marine related, will still carry opportunities to engage people. Furthermore the secondary benefit of introducing housing to this scheme has viability not only as a cross subsidiser to the expensive infrastructure costs of bringing the scheme forward but also in generating new households in an area thus bringing further spend into the area, and that in turn can generate more employment opportunities. A project on this scale will take some years to complete and to that end the opportunities for employment in the construction phase is both wide in terms of there being hundreds of people involved over a period of probably 4 to 5 years.

Councillor Lewis Davies referred to the concerns of the Countryside Council for Wales regarding the proposal for this coastline, and he asked Mr Jones whether the company as developers had had discussions with CCW as regards improving the environmental situation on which the CCW's concerns were based. Mr Jones replied by saying that throughout the preparation of the planning application, the developer had met the CCW on two separate occasions; however, the most important points to note were that after having spent many thousands of pounds on an environmental assessment and ecological survey and assessment, the CCW's objections relate to one aspect alone in relation to landscape and visual impact. As regards the hundreds of pages of ecological assessment there has not been any comment by CCW in relation to the ecological effects; its objection is limited entirely to landscape and visual impact. As he had pointed out in his address, landscape and visual impact are unquestionably a subjective matter ; the CCW has taken one view and the applicant takes a different view. Over the course of the determination period, the County Council's representatives on landscape and visual matters have through debate, introduced some modifications to the scheme that make the development acceptable to them. Mr Jones said that the developer has listened to that debate but that as a matter of principle, the CCW is unwilling to accept the landscape and visual effects. The developer sees them as beneficial whilst the CCW sees them as a loss of rocky coastline. In response to a further question by Councillor Lewis regarding the feasibility of further dialogue with the CCW regarding the landscape and visual effects, Mr David Jones said that the developer had endeavoured to understand precisely what the CCW is objecting to and it is essentially the loss of the rocky coastline. The extent to which the developer would need to adjust the scheme to accommodate CCW's perspective on the circumstances would be substantial and would reach the point where the cross subsidising of the expensive infrastructure costs would be compromised too far. The developer has reached something of an impasse with the CCW purely on the landscaping and visual effects aspects.

Councillor J.Arwel Roberts speaking in his capacity as a resident of Holyhead thanked the officers for the report but stated that he could not support the application in any way, shape or form. He believed it to be too large and a case of a private company coming in for its own gain rather than for the good of the town. The proposal represented the largest application submitted in Anglesey short of that for a power station or for a plant on the lines of Anglesey Aluminium. However, he did not feel that this proposal had within it the employment prospects of the power plant or Anglesey Aluminium; it is an outline application only although outline applications do have their own consequences for the town. Personally he was wholly supportive of promoting employment opportunities in Anglesey and especially in Holyhead as an area of high unemployment and he wanted to see the local economy flourishing. So it was with a heavy heart that he made such comments and they were not made lightly. He stated that he agreed with the majority of those people in Holyhead who had signed petitions and had written 370 letters of objection which was a significant number for one application – they reflected the strength of the opposition to the application. As a realist, he recognised that something would have to take place at some time in the areas in question and whilst he did not have major concerns regarding the proposals for Zones 2 and 3, he did have major reservations regarding the proposals for Zone 1. He pointed out that there is already a marina in Holyhead with unfilled berths and that the area cannot sustain another 500 berth marina. He reminded the Committee that the application under consideration is a departure application and that it was therefore well within the rights of the Committee to refuse permission. He referred to a document produced by the Isle of Anglesey County Council in 2005 entitled the Holyhead Conservation Area Character Appraisal wherein it is stated that the Planning, Listed Building and Conservation Act 1990 requires local authorities to designate conservation areas; any areas of special architectural or historic interest the character or appearance of which is desirable to preserve or enhance. He seriously questioned

whether the application under consideration and all it entailed would serve to enhance the area or whether in approving it, the Committee would be adhering to the document. He proceeded to quote extracts from the document to the effect that the Act seeks to preserve or enhance the character of an area rather than individual buildings, and that conservation areas should be seen as the prime means of protecting and enhancing the identity of places with special character. Designating an area as a conservation area does not prevent future change to the buildings or surroundings but does mean that the local planning authority, when considering planning applications including those which are outside the conservation area but which would affect it, must pay special regard to whether the proposed changes preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. He pointed out the anomaly of a situation wherein permission for a three storey building to replace the old naval building in Holyhead had been refused some time ago whilst an application on the scale of the one under debate which will take away the amenities of the people of Holyhead is being recommended for approval. He referred Members of the Committee to page 9 of the Officer's report which set out the bases of the objections to the proposal encompassing amongst many others the loss of view; the loss of Newry Beach as a marine habitat and recreational asset; detrimental impact on the conservation area and town centre; detrimental impact on the Welsh language, traffic concerns etc. He mentioned the policy context and what he perceived to be the inconsistent application of various policies in evaluating the application. He referred to the absence of a Welsh language impact assessment in the area and to the acknowledgement within the report's description of the application's housing element of the limited market that the type of accommodation proposed would be likely to serve and of its not being conventional housing of a type which currently exists or would be provided on allocated sites or sites with residential permission in Holyhead. Moreover, the application makes minimal reference to affordable housing. The Interim Planning Policy talks of up to 50% affordable housing provision. Councillor Roberts proceeded to refer to the hydrodynamic, sedimentation and wave climate elements linked to the proposal and took issue with certain aspects of the scientific information as set out in the report. He pointed out that the construction of the development would take many years and even if phased would represent a major blight on the town as a tourist attraction. He said that despite its being an outline application there were too many "ifs and buts" attached to it to make it acceptable. The taking of Newry Beach away from the residents is a step too far and is tantamount to raping the town. He questioned the availability of evidence to corroborate the reference to the £8m annual expenditure which it was projected the development could potentially generate in the locality as well as the number of jobs which it was estimated the development might create. He highlighted the comments made by the Legal Services Manager and urged the Committee to proceed with caution.

*Having made his representations, Councillor J.Arwel Roberts immediately left the Chamber and remained outside for the remainder of the debate and vote.*

Councillor R.Llewelyn Jones, was next invited to address the Committee in his capacity as Local Member for the Porthyfelin ward.

Councillor Jones said that the application as presented is for the largest ever development to come before the Council and that it was asking the Planning Committee to consent to taking away the only public seafront that the town of Holyhead has and to have permission to erect apartments along the seafront. He illustrated his comments by reference to the site map and described to Members the affected areas over which he was responsible as Local Member. He emphasised that there is no point to a promenade without the accompanying view and he stated that the developer is in effect asking for permission to destroy the beauty of Newry Beach for ever. He too referred to the number of objectors as reflected by the letters of objection and petitions submitted and he reminded the Committee that the development is classified as a departure application as it is in breach of development plan policies in relation to housing. When the Council formulated the development plan it did visualise the prospect of a large development and marina and the Inspector as quoted in the UDP said that "there should be no provision for marina development along the front on Newry Beach." The Council assented to that view and made a commitment to ensure that the conservation area was preserved for the use of the local and visiting public. Given that, he questioned the situation in which the Committee and Council found itself today in considering an application which appears to disregard this direction from the County Council and which is being recommended for approval.

Councillor Jones referred to the fact that the development plan talks of any developments having to provide 50% of dwellings on site as affordable housing, and he questioned whether what was in the report complied with that policy. He stated that the report sadly was silent on this particular issue and despite his having asked for details on this aspect no promise has been made for affordable homes, and indeed the developer states in the application that the accommodation proposed as part of the development is not considered to be affordable homes in the sense of affordable homes. Councillor Jones proceeded to point out the marked absence of detail in the assessment on many counts e.g. the economic benefits in the form of the number of jobs to be created and the amount of the inward investment likely to be forthcoming to the town. He also highlighted the absence of a Business Plan which was concerning given the scale of the development and which would have given an indication of how and where the employment opportunities would be created. He said the developer was asked to provide such a Plan. He believed it to be a worrying state of affairs for large companies such as this to inform the Council that it thinks a Business Plan to be unnecessary. Councillor Jones went on to draw the Committee's attention to the Planning Performance Agreement which is a charter for dealing with large applications and the issues arising from them which was approved by the Executive on 27 April, 2010. He said that he understood that the Agreement is passed to developers for their perusal and signature. He asked whether Conygar Stenaline had seen or signed the document. The charter sets out that developers have to engage with the public and with the local councillor; however he as Local Member had not succeeded in having a dialogue with Conygar Stenaline despite several requests, the reason given was that there would then have to be dialogue with other councillors. Councillor Jones emphasised the beauty of Newry Beach and the views over the Breakwater which he believed belonged to the local people and which were at risk from this proposal. He reiterated that the proposal was in conflict with policy and supplementary planning guidance for Newry Beach and might set a precedent for the erection of apartment blocks along waterfronts on Anglesey. He referred to Planning Policy Wales and quoted from the policy to the effect that in relation to "any proposed development which conflicts with the objective of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area or its setting, there will be a strong presumption against the granting of planning permission." He said that the people of Holyhead had faith that the Council's democratic system would prevail, and that the proposal would be returned to the applicant to reconsider as a plan that will not deprive them of their local beach or the unique views from the conservation area. It would be a tragedy of the greatest magnitude if the application was approved, and although the area does need employment opportunities Councillor Jones said that that does not have to mean giving over the area's heritage and waterfront to a marina and housing development. The beaches are tantamount to family heritage to be treasured for the enjoyment of all those that visit Anglesey and as such they must remain open to everyone regardless as to whether or not they can afford a high rise apartment. He urged the Committee to reject the application as it stands and for the developer to take heed of the views of the people of Holyhead and to work with them to bring forward a plan that protects the area's heritage, the Newry Beach and the conservation areas. As a final point of information, he stated that CADW contrary to what was stated in the report had confirmed that it could not comment on any planning application affecting the setting of a listed structure as the issue could be referred to the Welsh Government on appeal and any comments could therefore be seen as prejudging the consideration of such an appeal by the Welsh Government. He asked the Officers to take on board the information.

Councillor J.V.Owen addressed the Committee in his capacity as Local Member for the Parc and Mynydd ward. He stated that his main purpose was to establish the facts as opposed to the fiction to provide the Committee with the complete picture prior to its determination of the application. He established by questioning the Officer, that the proposal did not involve the erection of six storey flats nor did it mean blocking off the road to the promenade which he said were rumours that had been circulated at the time of the petition. He pointed out that he had made no comment regarding the application even though the perception was that he favoured it. He emphasised that he had always been consistent in his views regarding the need to repair and maintain the Breakwater. The then Government of the day did not place any restrictions on the listed building. He stated that with regard to the application he had had direct contact with three of the 900 constituents he represented, two in letter form and one verbally. The writer of the first letter said that they had no particular objections to the proposals for the area which he represented but were deeply concerned regarding the proposals for the Newry Beach area. The author of the second letter was concerned with loss of views. Councillor Owen said that he was

sympathetic with the views expressed, but that he felt that he had to put to the Committee the argument of the silent majority of the people of Holyhead. The third contact which was verbal expressed the view that the cost of maintaining the breakwater should be borne by the public purse either through CADW, direct taxation or via direct rates. Councillor Owen referred to his upbringing and familiarity with the area. He stated that his approach was to allow the professional planning officers to bring forward recommendations without any interference from himself, and that the recommendation as presented is based on planning law and it is on that basis that the application should be considered. He cautioned against allowing the heart to rule the head with the possible consequences of an appeal and the costs attendant on that process. He said that the petitions had been signed by many people in good faith and those people have to be admired for what they believe in. What he stood for was based on the information he heard. Although there is emphasis on high level jobs which are required and for which the Island's young people need to be prepared, there still remains a pressing need also for an ordinary workforce as well. The Holyhead Town Council has been asked for, and has given its observations regarding the application; it was strongly in favour of bringing the greens back into public ownership. There is now an opportunity for that to be realised and an opportunity also to ensure the maintenance of the Breakwater. He referred to the Planning Committee's Members and to the members of Holyhead Town Council as products of the democratic process having been elected to represent their areas. He pointed out that from 21 members 98% of the Town Council's members were in favour of the application as presented which is the true elected representation of the 11,000 residents of Holyhead as opposed to the 4,600 signatories of the petitions. He concluded by saying that he had addressed the Committee to give a different perspective to that provided by Councillor R.Llewelyn Jones and he now hoped that Members were in full possession of the whole picture.

In the subsequent debate, Councillor Jim Evans observed that he had listened carefully to all the arguments for and against the proposal as presented, and that his concerns were around the green area and the flats. Having been on the site visit he believed it was essential to maintain the Breakwater and the surrounding area.

Councillor W.J.Chorlton said that as a Holyhead Town Councillor with a vote as a Member of the Planning Committee, he found himself in a difficult position. He emphasised that he himself was born and bred in Holyhead and that he knew full well about poverty and how people improve themselves through hard work. The matter under debate today was a possible future for Holyhead. He referred to the fact that he had in the past voted for a retail development outside Holyhead which had involved persuading the Committee to see beyond the immediate difficulties – the development brought over 1,000 jobs to the area. That development was not responsible for a decline in the town of Holyhead; the town was effectively dead prior to that development when the utility services moved out of it and relocated and Sealink was sold. He stated that Holyhead had not recovered from those events and that as a town, it would have to reinvent itself in order to recover. He emphasised that the task involves looking at the bigger picture and in asking what future does Holyhead hold for its young people. He said he was frequently asked about job and housing opportunities and those could not be achieved by burying one's head in the sand. He believed that every major development in the Holyhead area in the past year or so had been affected by a "NIMBY" attitude with concerns expressed about loss of views and heritage without sufficient regard for the future of the youth of the area and for the future of Holyhead itself. He urged people not to take a blinkered view of the development – there would be houses but there would also be views over those houses. The proposed development could produce a great deal of work and it had to be regarded positively. Councillor Chorlton went on to say that it was not possible to predict that the development would be an absolute success but that no one would try to gain support for a scheme by producing falsehoods. His belief was that a future had to be created for the young people of the area and the Island and by rejecting everything, no future is likely to be created for anyone. He pointed out that the Promenade as it stands is in a very poor state of repair and that the greens are poorly maintained due essentially to a lack of funds for their upkeep. The lease on the greens is coming to an end meaning the loss of local control over them. The development provides an opportunity to bring the greens back into public ownership and an opportunity also to properly maintain the Breakwater. He highlighted the fact that there is already planning permission for housing in the area of the rocky coastline meaning the locality has little control over that in any case. However, the establishment of a Liaison Committee offered as part of the proposed development would provide through



proper representation a voice to the people of Holyhead and an opportunity to ensure that that aspect is undertaken tastefully and properly. Councillor Chorlton urged people to look to creating a future for Holyhead instead of closing the door on opportunities. He warned that by carrying on in this way, there would be no future for Holyhead for nothing would come to the town.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes stated that he very much wanted to see Holyhead prospering as a town and that he could indeed recall a time when the town was bustling. He acknowledged the extent of the opposition to the proposed development and he said that he suspected that much of that was due to potential loss of views – he pointed out that unfortunately there is no entitlement to a view. At the end of the day, if the proposal succeeds it will bring a great amount of work not only to Holyhead but to Anglesey in its totality. He said that he was rather perplexed by the views expressed by the Planning Officer and the Legal Services Manager which were somewhat conflicting, but that on the whole he supported Councillor Chorlton's stance on the matter that the prospect of employment is extremely important to Anglesey.

Councillor Clive McGregor said that the Committee had heard very clearly the two sides of the argument and that there was a very marked difference of opinion. He felt that in today's climate, regard should be had of the future and of the future of the Island's children. Councillor Chorlton had made the observation that Holyhead is a town that is dying, and it will die further if something is not done about it. He pointed out that the County Council has a responsibility to promote development and perhaps it would be helpful to consider how well business is doing in other towns which have had a marina and how much work such a development creates. From that perspective he proposed that the Committee accepts the Officer's recommendation that the application be approved.

Councillor R.L.Owen reminded the Committee that Beaumaris had been in a similar position a few years ago and that he felt it had lost out by not having a marina. He believed that the proposal was advantageous to Holyhead and he urged that it be accepted as something that would make all the difference to the town. He seconded Councillor McGregor's proposal of acceptance.

Councillors W.J.Chorlton, Jim Evans, Kenneth Hughes, R.L.Owen, Clive McGregor, Lewis Davies and Eric Roberts voted in favour of the proposal.

**It was resolved to accept the Officer's report and recommendation of approval subject to the conditions set out in the report (Councillors Richard Dew and Hefin Thomas did not participate in the discussion or the voting on the application as they had not been present on the site visit.)**

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that the application would now be forwarded to the Welsh Government on account of its being a departure from the development plan because of the large number of houses involved. The relevant 1992 Direction makes it obligatory on the Council to make that referral to the Welsh Government and to state that as a Council, it is minded to approve the application.

## **7.2 40C204G – Erection of a new holiday unit at Bryn Awelon Llanallgo**

The Planning Development Manager reminded Members that the application was originally referred to the Planning Committee at its meeting on 4 April, 2012 at the request of the Local Member. Consideration of the application was deferred at the request of the applicant's agent in order to allow further discussions with the Local Planning Authority with a view to possibly amending the application. On the morning of the Planning Committee correspondence was received from the applicant's agent confirming that the applicant did not wish to amend the application; the application was therefore presented to the Committee on 2 May, 2012 as per the original recommendation of refusal. At the Planning Committee, Members resolved to carry out a site visit and this was subsequently undertaken on 16 May. The Officer said that the basis for the recommendation of refusal was the fact that the application entails the erection of a new building in the countryside in a designated AONB, and that Officers take the view that the proposal conflicts with development plan policies as it is not considered that the proposed unit forms part of an overall integrated scheme which adds to the tourism and recreation facilities in the area. The

recommendation therefore still remains one of refusal. The Officer proceeded to draw the Committee's attention to correspondence received from the applicant's agent via e-mail that morning in support of the application. At the request of Councillor Hefin Thomas, the Officer read out to the Committee the main parts of the letter which he summarised as a statement and affirmation of the quality of the existing facilities on site.

Councillor Derlwyn Hughes addressing the Committee in his capacity as Local Member, thanked Members for undertaking the site visit and for the Officer's fair and balanced report on site. He reminded Members that the current B and B accommodation at Bryn Awelon has been operative for 8 years and has been rated 5 stars. The proposal for a new holiday unit as presented has generated 35 letters of support. He too as Local member along with the Community Council are strongly supportive of the application mainly on account of the fact that the area has recently lost two bed and Breakfast facilities comprising of 12 bedrooms in total. Whilst he believed the current economic climate has impacted on local businesses it has not affected Bryn Awelon which remains busy and popular due to the variety and standard of the provision on offer. Councillor Hughes said that through the proposal, Bryn Awelon is also offering something new in the form of a ground floor unit suitable for people with disabilities which is not provided by the current accommodation. He believed that Bryn Awelon plays an important role in tourism in the area and in relation to other businesses in terms of having a spin-off effect. Furthermore, the Destination Management Plan launched in 2011 notes the importance of tourism, and that such facilities support and are responsive to local opportunities. The Plan's objective is to increase by 10% the number of visitors who come and stay on Anglesey and he believed that this application contributes to that aim. In conclusion, Councillor Hughes said that the business at Bryn Awelon provides employment and income to local families throughout the year, a financial boost to a number of businesses and it constitutes a bread and butter business to the economy of Moelfre. Councillor Hughes pointed out that the application is not contrary to primary planning policies i.e. it is not a departure thus making it possible to approve the application today without contravening Welsh Government and local planning policies. He therefore asked the Committee to consider approving the application.

Councillor Eric Roberts observed that during the site visit questions had arisen regarding the static caravan currently on the site and he was of the opinion that what was being proposed instead of the caravan is likely to greatly enhance the facility and on that basis he proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes pointed out that the applicant is seeking permission to erect a new unit in the countryside within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and that moreover the applicant is proposing to replace an existing unauthorised caravan on site to obtain the new unit. He believed that the application contravened a number of policies and as such the Committee in his view had no choice but to refuse it in line with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor R.L.Owen referred to the beauty of the location as an advert for Anglesey. He felt that whilst the caravan as it stood was out of keeping with its surroundings, the stone work on the other buildings was worth seeing. He therefore supported the application.

Councillor Hefin Thomas said that as the one who had proposed the site visit originally he believed the visit had proved worthwhile in providing Members with a more accurate impression of the make-up of the site. He agreed with his fellow members in finding the location to be very pleasant and he was of the opinion that the proposal as presented would complete and round off what was on site in an appropriate and harmonious manner. Whilst he acknowledged that there is some dispute regarding the status of the on-site caravan, he felt it was not in keeping with the existing structures and that the proposed new single storey, stone finished accommodation would blend in with the surroundings perfectly. He drew attention to the standard of the existing facilities which the site visit had made clear and he believed that such a facility was a credit to Anglesey. He supported the application and suggested that permission could include a condition that the caravan is removed and should not at any time be reinstated.

Councillor Lewis Davies said he shared and seconded Councillor Kenneth Hughes's stance on the matter as the caravan on site was unauthorised and he feared that should the Committee approve the application it would provide a precedent for others to set up caravans in the countryside and to subsequently seek planning permission. He emphasised that regulations had been contravened in this instance and that the Committee should be seeking to ensure compliance with the regulations.

Councillor Clive McGregor said that he had been pleasantly surprised on the site visit to see how beautiful the location of Bryn Awelon was. He referred to the issue of the caravan and wondered whether the Officer's recommendation would be different if there was no caravan on site. He said the new unit which was the subject of the application would not be visible and would be sufficiently concealed by the surrounding landscape. He felt strongly that this is an important development in terms of both the local economy of the Moelfre area and that of Anglesey as it is a year round tourist attraction and more such facilities are required in order to promote tourism business on the Island. Therefore he too was in favour of approving the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

The Planning Development Manager highlighted the emphasis being placed by Members on the issue of the on-site caravan. The Officer advised that whilst the caravan is unauthorised, should the Committee approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation, then it will have to set out its reasons for doing so and he suggested that minimal weight should be attached to the existence on site of the static caravan.

Councillor Eric Roberts proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation and he was seconded by Councillor R.L.Owen. Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be refused and he was seconded by Councillor Lewis Davies.

Following the debate the voting was as follows –

To approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation: Councillors Jim Evans, E.G.Davies, W.T.Hughes, Clive McGregor, R.L.Owen, Eric Roberts, and Hefin Thomas. **Total 7**

To refuse the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation: Councillors Lewis Davies, Kenneth Hughes. **Total 2**

The reasons given for approving the application were on the basis that Policy 8 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan states that consideration be given to high quality accommodation, and that Policy CH2 of the Gwynedd Structure Plan states that holiday units such as this are permissible where they do not cause harm to the landscape.

**It was resolved to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation. In accordance with 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. (Councillors Richard Dew and J.Arwel Roberts did not participate in the discussion or the voting in respect of the application as they had not been present on the site visit)**

### **7.3 41C103M – Full application for the erection of a temporary 40.5m high anemometer on land at Ty Gwyn, Penmynydd**

The Planning Development Manager explained to the Committee that he was recommending that consideration of the application be deferred for the reason that the Officer's report in response to the reasons given by the Committee for refusing the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation at its meeting on 2 May deals only with the issue of visual impact and does not address concerns regarding tourism which were also cited by the Committee as a reason for refusing the application as recorded in the minutes of the 2 May meeting. A deferral would allow that aspect to be dealt with in fairness to all concerned.

**It was resolved to defer consideration of the application for the reason given.**

### **7.4 41C109D – Outline application for the erection of a dwelling and garage, the construction of a vehicular access together with landscaping on land adjacent to Artwood, Star**

The application was initially submitted to the Committee at its meeting held on 4 April, 2012 at the request of the Local Member at which members resolved to visit the site before making its determination. The site was visited on 18 April and the application was reconsidered at the meeting held on 2 May where it was approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the basis that the application complies with Policy 50 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan. The report addresses this matter and concludes that the proposal is not considered to accord with Policy 50 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan and therefore the recommendation remains one of refusal.

Councillor Eric Jones as the Local Member said that he had nothing to add to the representations he had made to previous meetings of the Committee regarding this matter apart from requesting the Committee to consider affirming its previous approval of the application.

Councillor Hefin Thomas proposed that the Committee's previous decision to approve the application be affirmed and he was seconded by Councillor R.L.Owen. Councillor E.G.Davies drew attention to the fact that at the 2 May meeting he had voted to refuse the application in line with the Officer's recommendation. However he had subsequently given very careful consideration to the matter and had revisited the site privately in order to be clear in his mind regarding the issues, and as a consequence of these deliberations he was now minded to approve the application.

**It was resolved to reaffirm the decision to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation. Standard conditions to apply to include a condition in relation to landscaping. (Councillors Richard Dew, Jim Evans and Clive McGregor did not participate in the discussion or voting in respect of the application as they had not been present on the site visit)**

## **8 ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS**

### **8.1 34C635/ECON- Erection of a new two storey Operational Police Hub building together with associated external works on land at Penyrsedd, Industrial Estate, Llangefni**

*Councillor W.T.Hughes declared an interest in the application and withdrew from the meeting during the discussion thereon.*

The application was reported to the Committee because the Isle of Anglesey County Council is the landowner. The Planning Development Manager requested that should Members approve the application, they assent to the inclusion of additional highway conditions in relation to the site access as part of the permission.

Councillor Hefin Thomas proposed that the application be approved and Councillor Eric Roberts seconded the proposal.

**It was resolved to accept the report and the Officer's recommendation of approval subject to the conditions set out in the report to include highway conditions in respect of the access.**

## **9 AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS**

There were none to be considered at this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

## **10 DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS**

There were none to be considered at this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

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

There were none to be considered at this meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

## **12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS**

### **12.1 10C113 – Full application for the change of use of former school hall into a dwelling, alterations and extensions thereto together with alternations to vehicular access at Old School House, Bodorgan**

The application is being reported to the Committee as the drainage connection is being made to Council owned apparatus.

**It was resolved to accept the Officer's report and recommendation of approval subject to the conditions listed in the report.**

**12.2 24C192D – Erection of a wind turbine with a maximum hub height of up to 15m, rotor diameter of up to 7.5m and maximum upright vertical tip height of up to 19m on land at Rhiwlas, Nebo, Penysarn**

The application is presented to the Committee at the request of the Local Member who has concerns regarding effects on the environment and the design of the turbine.

Councillor Aled Morris Jones as Local Member requested that the Committee visit the site in order for Members to see for themselves the site in its totality and the proximity of the proposal to Penysarn.

Councillor Hefin Thomas proposed that a site visit be undertaken and the proposal was seconded by Councillor E.G.Davies.

**It was resolved to visit the site at the request of the Local Member and for the reasons given.**

**12.3 30C398H – Retention and conversion of unauthorised building for use as stables together with retention of steel storage container at Ynys Ganol, Brynteg**

The application is reported to the Committee at the request of the Local Member.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the key issues in respect of the application are whether the retention of the building and its proposed use are acceptable. He referred Members to the site's planning history as documented in the report and specifically to the approval of an application for the conversion of an external building into a dwelling; the subsequent demolition of the dwelling and the erection of a new building on site. A series of applications for the retention of the building for various usages has then followed as well as two appeals both of which have been dismissed. Moreover an enforcement notice for the removal of the dwelling is in place and the applicant has been found guilty of non compliance and as such, fined. The Officer proceeded to say that it is the Officers' opinion based on the site's planning history that this application is the latest attempt to retain an unauthorised dwelling in a countryside location. He pointed out that the original approval for the conversion of the building was based solely on planning conversion policies and for whatever reasons the applicant then decided to demolish the building and to erect a new one in its place. The Policy regarding new dwellings in the countryside is clear. The position at present is that there is on site an unauthorised dwelling. There have been a number of applications, appeals and cases, and a history of refusal. The Officers do not consider that there is a case which justifies the retention of this building in the countryside and are of the opinion that if consent is given, in terms of the type, appearance and history of the building then that would be tantamount to permitting a new dwelling in the countryside. Therefore given the history of the site, the Officers are strongly opposed to the application and are not persuaded that a need for stables on this site is proven.

Councillor Ieuan Williams explained that he was present at the meeting at the request of the applicant as the Local Member had recently resigned. Councillor Williams asked the Committee to disregard the site's planning history and to consider the application as a new application in light of the proposed use of the building as stables rather than as a dwelling and not as a dwelling in the countryside. The building is currently a shell and it is proposed that the window openings are blocked and that the building is converted into three stables with doors. It is as a stable block that the building will be used should consent be given. Councillor Williams recognised that it might be difficult to disregard the planning history of this site but he emphasised that he believed that should planning permission be forthcoming for a stable block in this area then it would conform with policy in terms of sections 7, 30 and 40 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan and also with the stopped UDP with reference to GP1, GP2 and Environment 1. He believed also that the principle of sustainability does apply in this case in terms of making practical use of a building that is non compliant rather than its being demolished and the waste sent to the tip.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes observed that this situation would not have arisen had the applicant not demolished the original building in the first place. He said that the Committee cannot disregard the planning history and in light of the enforcement notice that is in place he was in no doubt as to supporting the Officer's recommendation of refusal. He proposed that the application be refused.

Councillor Hefin Thomas agreed with Councillor Hughes as to its being impossible to put aside the long planning history to this case and he said that giving consent to the application could not

really be countenanced as it would in effect mean tearing up planning policies and having to start anew. He seconded the proposal of refusal.

**It was resolved to refuse the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.**

**12.4 36C313A – Outline application for the erection of a dwelling on land adjacent to Eithinog, Llangristolus**

*Councillor J.Arwel Roberts declared an interest in the application and withdrew from the meeting during the discussion thereon. The Vice-Chair took the Chair for this item.*

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application is in outline form and is for the erection of a dwelling on the periphery of the village of Llangristolus. Llangristolus is defined as a Listed Settlement under policy 50 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan i.e. there is no development boundary thus making it possible to erect units on the periphery of the village as long as they fit in and do not have a harmful effect as regards certain other matters. However, the stopped Unitary Development Plan does identify a development boundary for Llangristolus and the application site falls outside of the village boundary as defined under Policy HP4 of the stopped UDP. The Officers take the view that the proposal as presented would result in ribbon development and constitute a harmful visual intrusion into the landscape which is designated as a Special Landscape Area under Policy 31 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan. Moreover, the Highways Authority has concerns regarding the proposal in terms of the road infrastructure being inadequate to accommodate additional residential units. The recommendation is therefore one of refusal.

Councillor Robert Lloyd Hughes as the Local Member requested that the Committee visit the site in order for Members to view similar developments which have been allowed in the village in recent years. Councillor Kenneth Hughes stated that he saw no reason to undertake a site visit and he proposed that the request be refused. He was seconded by Councillor Hefin Thomas. Members agreed that a site visit should not be undertaken. Councillor Lewis Davies believed that the application should be refused on the basis of the reasons set out in the report and he made a proposal to that effect. He was seconded by Councillor Eric Roberts.

**It was resolved to refuse the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.**

**12.5 47C132 – Full application for the erection of a high welfare building for dairy cows on land at Cae Mawr farm, Trefor**

The application was presented to the Committee as it is on Council owned land.

Councillor Eric Roberts proposed approval and he was seconded by Councillor E.G.Davies.

**It was resolved to accept the Officer's report and recommendation of approval subject to the conditions set out in the report.**

**13 OTHER MATTERS**

**13.1 11LPA101H/1/LB/CC – Listed Building Consent for work to upgrade the existing heating system at Ysgol Syr Thomas Jones, Amlwch**

Members were informed that the application will be forwarded to the Welsh Government for determination in accordance with Regulation 1 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) ACT 1990. Members noted the information.

*Prior to closing the meeting the Chair referred to the resignation recently of Councillor J.P.Williams as Member of the Council. Councillor Williams had been a member of the Planning Committee and it was agreed that a letter be sent to former Councillor Williams to thank him for his contribution to the Committee's deliberations and to convey to him Members' best wishes for the future.*

**Councillor J.Arwel Roberts  
Chair**