

# PLANNING AND ORDERS COMMITTEE

## Minutes of the meeting held on 31 July 2013

- PRESENT:** Councillor William Thomas Hughes (Chair)  
Councillor Ann Griffith (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors K P Hughes, John Griffith, Vaughan Hughes, Victor Hughes,  
Richard Owain Jones, Raymond Jones, Jeffrey M.Evans and Nicola Roberts
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Development Control Manager (DFJ)  
Chief Planning Officer (GJ)  
Planning Assistants  
Development Control Officer (Highways) (RE)  
Legal Services Manager  
Committee Officer (ATH)
- APOLOGIES:** Councillor Lewis Davies
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Member: Councillor Aled Morris Jones (application 7.1), Councillor  
Richard Dew, Councillor R.G.Parry, OBE
- 

### 1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were submitted and noted.

### 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were made as follows:-

Councillor W.T.Hughes in respect of application 7.1  
Councillor Victor Hughes in respect of application 7.3  
Councillor Vaughan Hughes in respect of application 12.3  
Councillor Kenneth Hughes in respect of application 13.3  
Councillor Ann Griffith declared a personal interest on account of the reference to wind turbines within the Plaid Cymru Manifesto but said that she would consider each application on its own merits

### 3 MINUTES 3RD JULY, 2013 MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 3rd July, 2013 were presented and confirmed as correct subject to the following amendment with reference to application 7.1 –

*The sentence "Councillor T.V.Hughes proposed that the application be refused. There was no seconder to his proposal," to read "Councillor Jeff Evans proposed that the application be refused. Councillor T.V.Hughes seconded the proposal."*

### 4 SITE VISITS 17 JULY, 2013

The minutes of the Site Visits held on the 17<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 were submitted and confirmed as correct.

The Legal Services Manager informed the Committee that the Chair and Vice-Chair have expressed concern regarding the number of Members absent from the 17<sup>th</sup> July site visits and would wish to ask Members of the Committee to make every effort to attend site visits both to ensure that there are

enough Members to be able to vote on the applications that are the subject of site visits when they are then further considered by the Committee and in recognition of the importance of site visits in the planning determination process.

## **5 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

The Chair informed that Committee that there would be Public Speakers on applications 12.2, 12.3 and 12.5

## **6 APPLICATIONS THAT WILL BE DEFERRED**

### **6.1 34C553A - Outline application for residential development including extra care facility, highway and associated infrastructure at Ty'n Coed, Llangefni**

The Development Control Manager informed the Committee that the application was originally reported to the Planning Committee in November 2008 because it had been advertised as a departure from the development plan and part of the submitted proposal was being recommended for approval. Due to the nature and context of the proposed development, it is considered that it would be beneficial for Members of the Committee to view the site prior to making any determinations.

**It was resolved to defer consideration of the application so that a site visit may be undertaken in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.**

### **6.2 41C8C - Full application for the change of use of land for the siting of 33 touring caravans, erection of a toilet block, construction of a vehicular access together with landscaping at Garnedd Ddu, Star**

The Development Control Manager summarised the background to the application and said that a site visit had been made by Members of the Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> June, 2013. Further information was then submitted in support of the application and in order to allow the expiry of neighbour notification and the consideration of representations and consultation replies arising from this additional information, the application was deferred. However, drainage matters remain under discussion and therefore it is recommended that the application is deferred.

**It was resolved to defer consideration of the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and for the reason given.**

### **6.3 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 cafe and watersports 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, Pare 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, cafe, 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 buildings at Penrhos Coastal Park, London Road, Holyhead including the change of use for: The Bailiffs Tower and outbuildings at Penrhos Home Farm from a cricket clubhouse to a visitors information centre, restaurant, cafe, bars and retail; Home Farm Barn and Cart Buildings from farm buildings to cycle and sports hire centre; The Tower from residential to a Managers accommodation and ancillary office; and Beddmanarch House from residential to a visitors centre at Penrhos Coastal Park, Cae Glas and Kingsland, Holyhead**

The Planning Development Manager informed Members of the Committee that it is anticipated that a full report on this application will be presented to the September, 2013 meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee. The Officer proceeded to say that at the site visit held on 19<sup>th</sup> June, Members indicated that they would wish to attend a further briefing session with regard to the proposals and it is recommended that this is convened on the same day as the scheduled August site visits.

The Principal Planning Officer confirmed that the purpose of the briefing session would be to allow Members to ask factual questions about the application and for officers to provide contextual information.

**It was resolved to defer consideration of the application and to convene a further briefing session on 21 August, 2013.**

## **7 APPLICATIONS ARISING**

### **7.1 20LPA962/CC - Retrospective application for the recently constructed track together with improvements to the existing access on land opposite From Heulog, Cemaes**

The application is presented to the Committee as the Isle of Anglesey Council is the applicant and land owner.

*Councillor W.T.Hughes having declared a personal interest in this application did remain at the meeting and provided background information in his capacity as a Local Member but did not take part in the voting thereon. Councillor Ann Griffith as Vice-Chair took the Chair for this item.*

The Development Control Manager informed the Committee that the application is made for alterations and improvements to an existing agricultural vehicular access onto the A5025 together with the retention of a stone track agricultural access, set back from the public highway. The principal considerations relate to highway safety, and the applicant has submitted a report which makes submissions as regards highway safety as documented in the written report. The applicant's report has been objected to and questioned by the objectors to the proposal, and the points of objection are detailed in the report. The objections have been forwarded to the Council's Highways Section. The Council's Highways Officer has assessed the applicant's submission together with the issues raised in the objections and considers the proposal to be acceptable. It should be noted that the landowner could utilise the existing access without making any improvements to it. The Officer's recommendation is one of approval.

Councillor John Griffith enquired about the access and whether it had been determined how far east it is sited for visibility purposes. He said that he had asked about this at the time of the site visit but that he had not had a definitive answer whether the visibility was within requirements.

The Development Control Officer (Highways) said that visibility from the access is currently poor from both directions towards Cemaes Bay and Amlwch. The modifications proposed as part of the application will widen and improve the access and will also broaden and extend visibility in the direction of Cemaes up to 215m. The access will still not provide as great a visibility towards Amlwch but will allow those exiting the access to have good visibility towards Cemaes and in coming out further onto the highway to be able to see the road in the direction of Amlwch. The Officer said that as the situation stands at present the visibility is very poor towards Cemaes. The Officer added that improvements are being proposed as part of the application and, bearing in mind that the access could be used without any improvements, the Highways section's viewpoint after weighing up the situation is that that the improvements are well worth accepting.

Councillor John Griffith wished to know the precise extent of the visibility towards Amlwch and whether a visibility of 160m is required by the Highways Section.

The Development Control Officer (Highways) confirmed that it is currently 50m extending to 120 to 150m on coming out onto the highway. He confirmed that in this situation the required visibility would be 160m.

Councillor John Griffith asked whether a similar application from new would be considered acceptable. The Development Control Officer (Highways) said that it is reasonable to accept the improvements as proposed.

Councillor Aled Morris Jones as one of the Local Members said that whilst he thanked the Highways Officer for his comments he was very concerned that the Officer acknowledges that it is necessary to come out into the highway to achieve visibility in the direction of Amlwch. He pointed out that this entrance has been created from new – there was an access point to the field lower down the road in the direction of Cemaes which was safer. The name given to this area is the "Betws Bends" and it is a very fast section of road. Whilst acknowledging the professional opinion, Councillor Jones said that he still had grave concerns about this issue. He said that it is a matter of creating a new access to the highway at a point where accidents do occur and which will possibly create additional problems in future. The Member pointed out that the three Local Members have asked the Council to address this matter. He emphasised that the old access was lower down the road – this access is new notwithstanding that it might not have been used for some time. He reiterated the concerns regarding road safety and the volume of traffic on the highway. The Council has not taken action on this matter and yet is prepared to allow another access onto the highway in what is a potentially hazardous place.

The Development Control Manager reiterated that there is an existing access on site which can be utilised unhindered and unchecked and that the Highways Officer has said that the application proposes improvements which would enhance road safety.

Following discussion about the siting of the access the Development Control Manager referred Members to the area's layout as illustrated by the site map. Councillor Victor Hughes asked whether it would be possible to re-site the access towards Cemaes in order to achieve a visibility of 160m.

The Development Control Officer (Highways) explained that the lower down the road the access is sited the worse the visibility up the road becomes. He referred Members to the site map and layout.

Councillor W.T.Hughes said that the area in which the access is situated is regarded as a potentially dangerous area and that there are concerns regarding possible accidents. He confirmed that the three Local Members have been asking the Council to take steps to improve the highway at that section in the interest of road safety.

The Development Control Manager again emphasised that the access has and does exist and can be used without any improvements or control on the part of the Council. He said that he understood Members' comments about it not being in the most ideal location, but the only changes proposed by the application are to improve the access thereby making it safer.

Councillor Nicola Roberts said she feared that the changes would also mean increased usage of the track and were not just a matter of improving the access to the field. She further inquired how what appeared from the map to be improvement work had been allowed to go ahead prior to consent being given.

The Development Control Officer (Highways) replied that a condition is proposed on planning consent that no part of the development shall commence until a visibility splay has been provided in the westerly direction in accordance with given specifications. The Officer said that the application is a retrospective application.

The Development Control Manager reminded Members that the access can be freely used without any constraints on traffic in and out. That remains the position albeit that the access has been improved.

Councillor John Griffith said that although he accepted that the access has and can be used he was worried by the prospect of a tractor and trailer wanting to turn right onto the highway on exiting the access with traffic coming at speed from the direction of Amlwch. He was concerned by the possible implications for the Council in terms of road safety of granting the application.

Councillor Jeff Evans said that if the application was a new application then it would likely be rejected, but the access is there and has been there for some time and can be used. He tended to agree with the Planning Officer that all that is going to happen is that there will be a better and improved access with highways conditions. Therefore he was not able to see what the argument is about given that the access that is there can be used at any time. He believed that if it can be improved then the improvements should be agreed thus improving lives also.

Councillor Victor Hughes said he concurred with Councillor Jeff Evans's viewpoint. He said that although the situation is not ideal he pointed out that septic tanks in use by the nearby council houses are in this location and Dwr Cymru and the Council's tankers have been using the access for a generation. He was concerned about possible increased usage, but the alterations as proposed are an improvement on what is there currently and will make the situation safer.

Councillor R.O.Jones as one of the Local Members said that any proposed improvement could only make the situation safer. He echoed previous comments about the road being hazardous and inquired whether it was possible to impose a 40mph speed limit on that particular section of the road.

The Development Control Officer (Highways) said that it was a suggestion that the Highways Authority could examine but as a separate process to that of granting planning consent.

Councillor Aled Morris Jones, a Local Member urged that the matter of the speed limit be looked into and dealt with expeditiously.

Councillor Victor Hughes proposed that the application be approved. There was no seconder to the proposal.

Councillor John Griffith proposed that that the application be refused. There was no seconder to the proposal.

Councillor Nicola Roberts inquired whether the application could be deferred to allow the Highways Authority to consider the proposal for a 40mph speed restriction on the relevant section of the highway.

The Development Control Manager said that deferral for that reason could place undue pressure on the Highways Officer and Section given that the process for changing a speed limit is a very different one to the planning process and is likely to take longer than the period from now until the next Planning Committee meeting. As a way forward, the Officer suggested that Planning Officers could request the applicant (the County Council) to amend the proposal in light of the Committee's comments regarding visibility and safety. Members found the suggestion amenable and Councillor John Griffith proposed that that course of action be adopted and Councillor Nicola Roberts seconded the proposal.

**It was resolved to defer determination of the application to allow the Planning Officers to consult with the applicant on the feasibility of amending the application in order to improve visibility and safety on entering the existing public highway.** *(Councillors Jeff Evans, Vaughan Hughes and Raymond Jones did not vote on the application as they had not been present on the site visit. Councillor R.O.Jones did not vote on the application as he was a Local Member)*

## **7.2 34LPA121Q/CC - Installation of a biomass wood pellet boiler unit in connection with the new school to be erected on land at Ysgol Gyfun, Llangefni**

The application is reported to the Planning and Orders Committee because the Isle of Anglesey County Council is the applicant and the landowner. A site visit was carried out by Members of the Committee on 19<sup>th</sup> June, 2013.

The Planning Development Manager said that Planning Officers are satisfied with the principle of development in terms of the use of renewable energy and energy conservation as according with planning policies and he reminded Members that planning permission has already been given in August 2012 for a biomass wood boiler in connection with the school with a flue height of 11.5m. This is a revised full planning application for a wood pellet biomass boiler unit. The proposal would entail the siting of a steel container (12m by 3.7m by 3.5m high) centrally within the site which would be clad to match the existing school. Wood pellet fuel would be stored within the container. As part of this planning application, the proposed flue would be increased in height by 3.5m to 16m in order to be clear of any turbulence caused by wind to enable the exhaust gases from the boiler to disperse without causing nuisance or harm and taking into account the proximity and height of adjacent buildings. The Officer confirmed that the Council's Environmental Health Section has not raised any objections to the proposal subject to the conditions recommended and specifically conditions 2,3 and 4.

In terms of the proposal's visual appearance and relationship with its surroundings, the flue is a relatively slim structure and it is not considered that the increase in height would be unacceptable in the context of the overall school development within an urban area. The Officer went on to say that a number of issues were raised at the time of the site visit with regard to traffic in connection with the delivery of the wood pellet fuel and the storage thereof. He could confirm that the latter would be delivered at 3 to 4 week intervals during the winter and at 8 to 10 week intervals during the rest of the year. The delivery vehicle will be a 14 ton vehicle equivalent to, or smaller than a bus. He was confident that the school's health and safety policy would apply during those times. The resultant ash generated by burning the wood pellets will be stored in a purpose made container on site and emptied every fortnight to be used as fertiliser on site on ground to be landscaped. As regards the possibility of integrating the use of the boiler unit by extending the electricity supply generated to other units on site, it has been confirmed that this is not possible due to the fact that those other buildings have upgraded their facilities recently and also because the proposed biomass boiler has not been designed to serve anything other than the school building. So that option is not technically or financially feasible. Having regard to all the material planning considerations, the recommendation therefore is one of approval.

Councillor Jeff Evans said that from the information presented, he could not see any major detrimental effects on nearby households and that the health issues do not appear to be problematic. The delivery of the pellets will take place about ten times a year and the ash used on site, so he believed that everything had been done to meet requirements to ensure that it is a successful application.

Councillor Nicola Roberts as a Local Member said that possible health effects is a major concern and despite increasing the height of the flue, residents remain worried that with a prevailing wind fumes will be carried to their properties. She asked if the Officers could respond to this concern and give assurance in terms of people's health that there will be no problems caused by smoke and fumes. In the event of any subsequent difficulties after the flue has been built she asked what would residents be expected to do.

The Planning Development Manager said that the Council's Environmental Health Officers have considered the proposal carefully and have concluded that emissions will not create health problems in the area. In the absence of any other evidence, as a Planning Officer he would favour that interpretation.

Councillor Nicola Roberts asked if the Environmental Health Officers' report could be made available to residents in the area who have concerns about potential health problems. The Planning Development Manager confirmed that reports on file are publicly available.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes pointed out that consent has already been given previously for a wood boiler in relation to the school and that many of the issues raised should have been addressed at that time. He said that he was happy to second Councillor Jeff Evans's viewpoint – Councillor Jeff Evans confirmed that he was formally proposing that the application be approved and Councillor Kenneth Hughes seconded the proposal.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and subject to the conditions listed in the written report.** *(Councillor Nicola Roberts as a Local Member did not vote on the matter and Councillor Richard Owain Jones did not vote as he had not been present on the site visit).*

### **7.3 42C231 - Full application for the erection of 13 new dwellings together with creation of a new access on land at The Sidings, Pentraeth**

The application is a departure from Local Plan Policy but can be permitted under the Unitary Development Plan.

*Councillor Victor Hughes having declared an interest in the application withdrew from the meeting during the discussion thereon.*

The Planning Development Manager confirmed that a site visit had been undertaken meaning that Members will now be familiar with the site. The main issues arising relate to the access to the site and the density of the development. He noted that during the Committee's previous meeting, questions were asked about land ownership; the Officer said that the report clarifies that the applicant has confirmed that the application site is owned and there is a covenant which does not encroach on the part to be developed and that its removal is being negotiated. With reference to the number of affordable homes to be provided as part of the development, the Officer confirmed that that provision will be 30% but that he also understood from discussions taking place that due to the nature and size of the development, the remainder of the proposed dwellings are likely to be relatively low cost as well. The Officer said that having taken into account the material planning considerations, the recommendation is one of approval.

Councillor Vaughan Hughes, a Local Member said that he was concerned that a local gentleman who runs an electrical business on the site had during the pre-committee briefing been refused permission to speak at this meeting. He believed that the person in question did have information that would be of benefit to the Committee to hear prior to its determining the application. Notwithstanding the rules, and in the interest of transparency it was a matter of regret to him that someone who in his opinion possessed relevant information was not allowed to have his say.

The Legal Services Manager confirmed that the Chair at the briefing meeting held earlier that morning had refused the request to speak at this meeting on the grounds that the public speaking rights with regard to this application had been exercised at the previous meeting of the Committee. The Legal Officer explained that there was nothing to prevent the individual referred to by Councillor Vaughan Hughes providing his observations either through Councillor Hughes as a Local Member today or otherwise in writing to the Planning Authority. The Officer confirmed that Councillor Hughes could speak on behalf of the person as a Local Member.

Councillor Vaughan Hughes reiterated his wish that the person wishing to speak be allowed to address the Committee. The Legal Services Manager confirmed that that request had been rejected by the Chair as the public speaking process on this application had taken place at the previous committee meeting. Councillor Hughes said that Mr Riley Walsh as the person wishing to address the committee was not aware that he did not have the right to speak at the time and that one of the objectors registered to speak had not taken up that right. Therefore Mr Riley Walsh's testimony has not been heard by the Committee and he asked whether there would be any consequences if the public speaking rule was relaxed to allow Mr Walsh to share his information with Members at this meeting. He suggested that the rule provides guidance and that it is a matter for the Committee whether it wishes to follow the guidance. The Legal Service Manager said that the rules are there for a purpose and that under the Constitution the Chair can exercise his discretion in this matter.

The Chair said similar circumstances had arisen previously namely individuals not perhaps taking advantage of the opportunity to speak soon enough and that it was not a matter of refusing Mr Walsh the opportunity of making his views known to the Committee but of acting in the interest of fairness and consistency to those who might have lost the opportunity to speak in the past. Councillor Vaughan Hughes said that he felt that considerations of transparency and of the public being able to see that justice is being done at the meeting are more important than rules which do not necessarily have to be adhered to.

The Chair replied that Councillor Hughes could speak for Mr Walsh as a Local Member. Councillor Hughes agreed to do so with the proviso that as Mr Walsh had only been made aware that he could not address the meeting that morning, his presentation would be far less powerful than that which Mr Walsh would have been able to make himself as a person who works on the site.

Councillor Nicola Roberts asked whether it would be possible to defer consideration of the application to allow Mr Walsh to address the committee at the next meeting thus showing respect to both parties and fair play to all Members in terms of allowing them the opportunity to obtain the information in full. Councillor Kenneth Hughes said that the Chair had come to his decision and that decision should be respected – the rules exist and in the interest of fairness to all, the rules need to be kept.

Councillor Vaughan Hughes speaking as a Local Member informed the Committee that contrary to what the developer has said according to the Planning Officer, two sections of the development site are on land which according to Mr Riley Walsh belong to him and his family and not to the developer and that consequently, the number of parking spaces available are 4 less in number than that referred to. Moreover, a covenant exists which prevents building on an area of the site amounting to 150 feet. Councillor Hughes emphasised that the matter of ownership does contradict what the developer has said, and whilst he personally could not confirm the matter one way or the other, the statement of ownership by the developer is being challenged.

The Legal Services Manager said that he would suggest that Mr Riley Walsh provides written evidence to the Planning Authority to corroborate his assertion which the Planning Officers can then consider. If the applicant has made an application to develop a piece of land not in his ownership and without giving appropriate notice to the rightful owner, then there is place to consider whether the application is valid. However, the matter cannot be addressed until written evidence is provided in support of the allegation made.

Councillor Jeff Evans pointed out that when he questioned the area of ownership and development at the Committee's previous meeting he was informed that neither was a consideration and that issue to be considered was the planning application. He felt that it amounted to a travesty to be

asked to consider a planning application when there is no proof of land ownership and that he personally did not believe in passing something without that knowledge. He believed it to be a relevant consideration at the time of considering the application. On a further point, Councillor Evans sought an explanation of what “affordable” housing means in real terms and to whom are affordable housing deemed to be affordable and whether a specific monetary value applies.

The Legal Services Manager said that the Welsh Government’s Technical Advice Note 2 provides a definition of affordable dwellings and the whole concept of affordable dwellings and is available on the Welsh Government’s website. As a way forward with the application under consideration, the Officer suggested that if the Committee is satisfied with the application’s planning merits, it can delegate approval subject to the receipt of proof of ownership. Should the evidence received not prove the allegation made then the planning consent can be released. If it is the case that the evidence does support the allegation and that what is being said is accurate, then the situation is that whilst land ownership in itself is not crucial to the planning process, giving notice to the rightful owner of the relevant section of the site is a legal requirement. Therefore in effect it is the process rather than the substance of the matter that is under question. The Committee would need to determine a timeframe within which Mr Riley Walsh would provide proof of ownership.

Following a brief discussion where it was suggested that proof of ownership be provided within two weeks, it was agreed through Councillor Vaughan Hughes that that timescale was acceptable to Mr Riley Walsh. Councillor Jeff Evans said that it would be equally possible for the developer to provide evidence that he has bought the land in question and therefore owns it.

The Planning Development Manager explained that as part of the planning application process, every applicant has to submit a certificate of land ownership. The applicant has provided the same with his application in confirmation that he is the landowner. Customarily that is deemed sufficient in order to be able to proceed. Following questions raised at the Committee’s previous meeting confirmation was sought that the site in question is indeed in the applicant’s ownership and he has confirmed that that is the case. Therefore it would appear that it is a matter for the person challenging that ownership to provide evidence to support the challenge.

Councillor Nicola Roberts proposed that the application be deferred until the Committee is in full possession of all the information with regard to land ownership. Councillor John Griffith seconded the proposal.

**It was resolved to defer consideration of the application to allow the Planning Officers to obtain evidence of land ownership. The evidence to be supplied to the Officers within two weeks of this meeting.** *(Councillors Jeff Evans and Raymond Jones did not vote on the matter as they had not been present on the site visit. Councillor Vaughan Hughes did not vote as a Local Member)*

## **8 ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS**

None considered at this meeting.

## **9 AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS**

None considered at this meeting.

## **10 DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS**

### **10.1 Full application for the erection of a dwelling together with the formation of a vehicular access on land adjacent to Minffordd Cottage, Penlon, Newborough**

The application is presented to the Committee as an application which is contrary to the adopted Ynys Môn Local Plan but that can be supported under the Stopped Unitary Development Plan.

The Planning Development Manager explained that although the application is considered a departure it is one which the Officers are recommending for approval. Penlon is not recognised as a village in the Ynys Môn Local Plan but under the provisions of Policy HP5 of the Stopped Unitary

Development Plan it is identified as a hamlet. This policy allows the development of single plots as long as they are infill sites. The site map clearly illustrates that the application site is an infill site with dwellings situated on either side and to the back. The recommendation is therefore one of approval.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be approved; Councillor Jeff Evans seconded the proposal.

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

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

None considered at this meeting.

## **12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS**

### **12.1 12LPA983/AD/CC – Application for the siting of an interpretation panel at Gallows Point, Beaumaris**

The application is presented to the Committee at is made by the Local Authority.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be approved and his proposal was seconded by Councillor R.O.Jones.

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

### **12.2 22C211C – Full application for the erection of one wind turbine with a maximum hub height of 25m, a rotor diameter of 19.24m and a maximum vertical upright height of 34.37m on land at Yr Orsedd, Llanddona**

The application is reported to the Committee as it has been decided that delegated powers will not be used in connection with wind turbine developments.

The Planning Development Manager said that the report specifies three key issues in connection with the proposal in respect of the principle of development, the landscape and visual impact and residential amenity. Whilst it is recognised that there is support within policies for renewable energy projects it is considered that in this instance the proposed development would create unacceptable harm to this environment and it is on those grounds that the Officer's recommendation is to refuse the application.

The Chair invited Mr John Alexander, an objector to the proposal, to present his views to the Committee.

Mr Alexander highlighted the following as points of objection to the proposal:

- Anglesey is not listed as a strategic zone for onshore wind energy and according to TAN 8 it was never intended that these machines should spread willy nilly all over the Island.
- This turbine application should not have passed the screening process. The Planning Authority should have checked with the transmitter users – Police, BT and Aquiva for problems with interference. There is a major problem and a number of objections pin pointed this possibility. An investigation at the time of screening would have saved time and costs.
- The noise assessment figures are guesswork as there has not been an anemometer erected in the location.
- The site is too close to 3 dwellings, the AONB, ancient and historic sites and 18 designated sites. It will impact on Beaumaris and the Snowdonia National Park. The location is surrounded by high value landscape and an area that is geologically outstanding and of international importance. It would therefore ruin one of the most spectacular views on the Island.

- The location is very close to the Grade II listed building, Rhos Isaf and the associated dairy used as holiday accommodation. It would also adversely affect Hafoty, one of the oldest properties on the Island.
- The CCW states that an EIA is not required and that it does not have records of any statutory protected species in the locality. The Council should contact the RSPB and its own Ecological Advisor. An EIA would be required due to the height of the proposed development and the presence in the area of bats, otters, goshawks, hobbies, peregrine falcons and buzzards.
- The A5109 is on the main tourist route to the ancient and historic sites and to the Blue Flag Beach so there would be significant adverse effect on tourism.
- There is no community benefit deriving from the development as the electricity generated will go straight to the National Grid. The expensive electricity costs to the dairy farm could be offset by a 12m microgeneration close to the farm buildings and which has been suggested to the applicant.
- The proposal does not meet many of the conditions of the recent SPG.
- Currently Anglesey has the highest number of onshore wind turbines in Wales given the size of the Island and its population.
- The Island needs a nuclear power station and efficient renewable energy projects such as solar energy and tidal turbines that will create jobs.
- There is no point to having nearly all the Island's coastline designated an AONB and establishing an internationally renowned coastal path if the interior of what is a small island is to be filled with massive industrialised wind turbines. These ugly and inefficient machines will be visible from all over the Island and from the Snowdonia National Park. It would lead to an industrialised landscape.

Mr Alexander concluded by saying that he supported the recommendation of refusal.

There were no questions to Mr Alexander from the Committee's Members.

The Chair then invited Mr Delwyn Owen-Parry to address the meeting in support of the application.

Mr Owen-Parry explained that his family represent the third generation of dairy farmers at yr Orsedd and that they wish to diversify. Currently, the farm uses about 50,000kw annually and ways of reducing costs are being considered. The process of producing milk uses a great deal of electricity. Mr Owen-Parry said that he foresaw that the amount of electricity used by the farm each year will increase to 120,000 kw during the next 5 years. The proposed turbine would generate 180,000kw per annum thus making the farm self-sufficient in the long-term. It will also create additional income and will help to ensure the farm's future.

Mr Owen-Parry went on to say that the Officer's report proposes refusal of the application because of the harm it would cause to the landscape. The location of the proposed turbine has been chosen because it is on land in the family's ownership at a point farthest away from the village, the AONB and the Heritage Landscape Area of Penmon. Although consideration was given to a smaller turbine capable of generating 10 to 15,000 kw of electricity, it is unlikely to be affordable given the distance from the National Grid. Another option is to locate the turbine closer to the farm but that then would mean that it would be located within the Heritage Landscape Area of Penmon, it would be closer to the village and on slightly higher ground. This option would offer fewer advantages in terms of renewable energy on site.

Mr Owen-Parry drew the Committee's attention to the fact that national policies support small scale community renewable energy projects. Wales needs to support such projects especially when the advantages are of benefit to the community in question. He said that he believed that this is true of the application – the electricity will be used locally and will contribute towards reducing the carbon footprint.

Mr Owen-Parry highlighted that the Officer's report makes very little mention of the advantages offered by this development which is a shortcoming as regards putting both sides of the case. He therefore asked the Committee to consider very carefully the advantages deriving from this scheme.

Wind turbines by their very nature are things which are visible from various sites but it must be noted that the location is dependent on the need to harness the wind power. Sites which are suitable for this purpose have to be used. The Committee will know that there aren't many employment opportunities on Anglesey with many young people having to travel far to work or move away altogether. The proposed wind turbine will be funded by the family personally and will enable the family to remain employed in the local area. It is a matter of two young families asking Members to give them an opportunity to live and work in their rural village where they have been brought up.

Mr Owen-Parry concluded by saying that he did not believe the proposal should be refused on the basis of effect on landscape alone. He again emphasised that the proposed turbine will not be within an AONB or within the Heritage Landscape Area of Penmon. Moreover it will not affect wildlife and it is within an acceptable distance to nearby dwellings. He thanked the Committee for hearing him and asked Members to consider the application fairly and not to allow the minority to divert attention from the facts.

There were no questions to Mr Owen-Parry from the Committee.

Councillor John Griffith pointed out that previous proposals of this nature have been the subject of a site visit and in the interest of fairness he proposed that the application site in question be visited by the Committee's Members. Councillor Nicola Roberts seconded the proposal for the same reason.

The Planning Development Manager reminded the Committee that site visits are governed by a protocol the main criterion being that a significant advantage must be gained from conducting a site visit. The Committee therefore will have to state what that advantage is likely to be in this case.

Councillor John Griffith said that the Committee wishes to satisfy itself regarding the potential effects of this proposal on the landscape and AONB and its proximity to other dwellings.

**It was resolved that a site visit be undertaken for the reasons given.**

### **12.3 23C268B – Full application for the conversion and extension of an outbuilding to form a residential dwelling together with the installation of a package treatment plant at Uwch y Gors, Mynydd Bodafon**

The application has been referred to the Committee by the Local Member who considers that the proposal complies with the conversion policies.

*Having declared an interest in this application, Councillor Vaughan Hughes withdrew from the meeting and did not take part in the discussion thereon.*

Sioned Edwards was invited by the Chair to put her case to the Committee in support of the application.

Ms Edwards addressed the Committee by saying that the applicant is a local man who is at present living in a caravan within the curtilage of his father's house at Uwch y Gors. Last year the applicant and his wife adopted two young boys and the four hope to be able to continue to live locally in Mynydd Bodafon following the conversion of the outbuilding into a residential dwelling. The outbuilding was used as a storeroom and workshop but hopefully the building can be returned to a more beneficial use as a home for Richard Williams and his family.

Ms Edwards said that it is recognised that the current outbuilding is fairly small in size and in order to ensure that it provides a habitable dwelling, it is necessary to extend the building. The proposed extension is a modest one providing a dwelling of 70m square comparable to a two bedroom flat. The outbuilding as it is, is not attractive and does not contribute at all to the designation of the area as an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The extension that is being proposed would substantially improve the appearance of the building and provide a home to a young local family.

Ms Edwards pointed out that Policy 55 of the Local Plan and Policy HP8 of the Anglesey Stopped Unitary Development Plan provide for flexibility in the size of extensions when converting outbuildings providing that the proposal substantially improves the appearance of the building. The

policy also favours the adaptation of rural buildings when otherwise those buildings would fall into ruin to the detriment of the local landscape.

Ms Edwards said that the landscape around the building has been carefully considered as part of the design process and the proposal offers a design that makes the most of the space below the current building and builds downwards. She concluded by saying that she hoped greatly that the Committee would support a young local man to convert the outbuilding at Uwch y Gors into a home for himself and his family.

The Planning Development Manager said that he acknowledged the personal circumstances in support of the application. However, the application site is in a countryside location in an area not recognised as a hamlet. Conversion policies do allow the conversion of outbuildings into dwellings with the proviso that the vast majority of the existing building must be structurally sound and should remain to be incorporated into the scheme. Only a minor extension would be permitted to the building. The Officer said that in this particular instance, approximately 26.8m square of the existing walling is to remain and 122 m square will be created giving an 80% addition. The proposal as presented cannot be reconciled to the policies on conversion and, given the extent of the new works involved amounts more to a new building in a countryside location. The Officer's recommendation is therefore one of refusal.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes said that unfortunately personal circumstances are not a planning consideration and that he concurred with the Officer's viewpoint; he therefore proposed that the application be refused. His proposal was seconded by Councillor Raymond Jones.

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

#### **12.4 30LPA978/AD/CC – Application for the siting of an information panel at Red Wharf Bay**

The application is presented to the Committee as it is made by the Local Authority.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be approved and his proposal was seconded by Councillor R.O.Jones.

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

#### **12.5 34C648A – Outline application for the erection of a dwelling together with alterations to the existing access on land at Pwros, Rhosmeirch**

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

At the invitation of the Chair, Mr Richard Owen addressed the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Richard Owen said that the proposed dwelling was meant for his daughter and her husband and their one year old daughter. Should the outline application be approved Mr Owen said that they would conform with any conditions imposed by Planning Officers as the family is keen that the dwelling should be in keeping with the local environment as they have lived in Rhosmeirch for generations and would not wish to impair the appearance of the village. The site is within the management boundary of Llangefni Town Council and does not extend into the countryside – the boundary is beyond where the development site is to be situated. Mr Owen explained that his own house of Pwros although set back from the road is within the village and therefore this proposal does not extend farther – the site is between Pwros and the village's community centre. There is a building nearby which serves as the community hall and which caters for the youth club, Merched y Wawr etc so there won't be any substantial gap between the proposed new dwelling and the existing building of the community centre. The family therefore does not believe that the proposal will lead to ribbon development as it is under the management of Llangefni Town Council. Mr Owen said that he understood that personal circumstances are not a consideration but notwithstanding he was at a funeral recently when the talk was of "old faces" disappearing and he would ask where will the old

faces come from in future. There are few young people in Rhosmeirch currently – his own family have had a connection with Rhosmeirch for nearly two centuries and although people of his age in the family are still living in Rhosmeirch, there is only one from a younger generation and that only because she has been bequeathed land by her late grandfather. The village, the chapel, the local community centre and village association committee all support the application. His daughter and her husband are already members of various organisations in the village even though they do not at present live in Rhosmeirch. The land on which the application is made is a part of land owned by himself and is not land on which he would want to see further development but only for the purpose of having his daughter close by to himself and his wife.

Councillor R.O.Jones inquired about the location of Pwros on the map. The Planning Development Manager referred Members to a picture of the application site forming a corner of a plot adjacent to Pwros. The Officer proceeded to say that personal circumstances have again been cited in support of an application and he reminded the Committee that the use of the land is under consideration from a planning perspective. The fact that the land is under the management of Llangefni Town Council is not material to the decision on land use which will be made at today's meeting since that assessment is made on the basis of current policies and the application site, which is in a field. In addition to that set out in the written report, 4 further letters of support have been received and those can be seen in the correspondence pack. The Planning Officer's standpoint on the application is that it does not conform with policy even though Rhosmeirch is identified as a hamlet in the Development Plan. The policy stipulates that single dwellings will be permitted on infill sites or other acceptable sites that are immediately adjacent to the developed part of the rural hamlet and clusters. It is considered that the proposal under consideration intrudes into the countryside and would serve to extend ribbon type development into an open countryside location to the detriment of the location's character and appearance. The Officer's recommendation is therefore one of refusal.

There followed a brief discussion about the picture of the site as shown. The Planning Development Manager referred Members to an alternative perspective which showed the application site relative to the community centre and other dwellings up the road. Councillor John Griffith inquired how far from the village is the application site; the Officer said that that information is not available as there is no boundary to the village and that it is a matter of infill sites or utilising sites that are immediately adjacent to the developed part of the village. Whatever the distance, the issue is that the application site is within a field that extends into the countryside.

Councillor Nicola Roberts speaking as a Local Member emphasised the local connections of the applicants and the family over decades as well as the full part they play in what is a close community. The landowner is supportive of the applicant's intentions as he wishes to have his daughter and her family back home. The purpose of erecting this dwelling is to allow Bethan Jones to move home to lend assistance to her mother and father as they get older. The intention and priority for the family is to erect a dwelling that is in keeping, and empathises with the local environment. The access to Pwros which is in use will also be used as the main access to the new dwelling. Neither the dwelling nor the access will impair current travelling or walking patterns within the area nor traffic, public footways or cycle paths. Permission has already been given for a connection to nearby water and sewerage facilities. The land in question is agricultural land with a low value and which the landowner and family have no intentions of further developing for any financial gain. The proposed dwelling being situated on land between Pwros and Rhosmeirch community centre will not impair anyone's views and any effects on the landscape will be minimal. The development land is within the boundary of Rhosmeirch which is within the Anglesey Local Plan for development and is therefore only a reasonable extension to the village. There is no objection locally to the development – the community is in fact supportive of the proposal with letters of support having been received from a number of sources including the local town councillor who resides in the village. The application brings with it language considerations given that the family is very supportive of the Welsh Language and would wish to see its use being developed in the village which is very important in the light of the deterioration in the use of the language on Anglesey. In conclusion Councillor Roberts asked the Committee to consider the application very carefully and if possible to undertake a site visit in order to see how close the application site is to the village.

The Planning Development Manager said that the application is made on a piece of land and cannot be restricted to any individual. If consent is granted then that consent will be on the land in question and not the person making the application. The Officer reiterated that who the applicant is, is not a

factor in relation to granting planning consent on a piece of land and that no restrictions can be placed on who would live in this dwelling if the application is granted as it would be a house on the open market. Therefore to determine an application on the basis of who the applicant is rather than on the application's planning merits is dangerous. The applicant's personal merits and the strength of their contribution to the community are not factors that outweigh policy considerations.

Councillor Ann Griffith sought clarification regarding the village's boundary given that the Local Member had said one thing and the Officer another. The Planning Development Manager said that Rhosmeirch does not have a development boundary; there is a policy under the Local Plan that permits single dwellings on infill sites or on the reasonable limits of the village and the same kind of provision carries through to the Stopped Unitary Plan and the same criteria apply. It is planning fact that there is no definite boundary to the village.

Councillor Jeff Evans said that he believed that the first picture of the application site shown was disadvantageous to the proposal and that showing it from another viewpoint which includes the community centre and other developments close by makes the situation clearer. There have been no local objections to the proposal and although it may well be technically against policy, Councillor Evans thought that local conditions, the people and the intentions of individuals having been born in an area and wanting to live there have to be taken into consideration. He said that sometimes the real issues have to be taken into account i.e. the retention of people in their own village speaking their own language and supporting their own community.

The Planning Development Manager reminded the Committee of the need to be consistent in dealing with applications given that it had already refused an application in which personal circumstances featured. He again emphasised that applications should be determined on the basis of planning policy considerations and not on the basis of the applicant. Councillor Nicola Roberts acknowledged the need for consistency but pointed out that each application is different to the one before and should be determined on its own merits.

Councillor Richard Owain Jones said that having heard all the arguments presented and in seeing the map of the development site and its surroundings and if it is within reasonable limits of the village he was prepared to support the application.

Councillor Vaughan Hughes said that the First Minister for Wales has recently expressed concern regarding the erosion of Welsh communities and has said that the language factor should be a planning consideration in future. Whilst he recognised that Officers have to work under current conditions, he emphasised that the Welsh language will die out on the Island unless young people such as the applicants, are able to live in their communities.

Councillor Jeff Evans proposed that the application be approved and his proposal was seconded by Councillor Vaughan Hughes.

Councillor John Griffith proposed that a site visit be carried out as suggested by the Local Member and his proposal was seconded by Councillor Ann Griffith.

In the subsequent vote, Councillors Jeff Evans, Raymond Jones, R,O,Jones and Vaughan Hughes voted to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

Councillors Ann Griffith, John Griffith and Kenneth Hughes voted for a site visit to be undertaken.

**It was resolved to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the grounds that the application is deemed to be within reasonable development limits of the village of Rhosmeirch.**

**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. (Councillor Nicola Roberts as a Local Member did not vote on the matter).**

## **12.6 34LPA982/CA/CC – Conservation Area Consent for the demolition of the existing building at The Stilts Building, Llangefni**

The Planning Development Manager explained that the application has been submitted due to the fact that the building exceeds 115 cubic metres meaning that Conservation Area Consent is required for the demolition of any building/structure which exceeds this amount. When funding becomes available the building will be demolished and the land will be turned into parking spaces thus allowing for more room to manoeuvre around the bend when entering the car park and improving visibility to and from the site.

Councillor Jeff Evans proposed that the application be approved and his proposal was seconded by Councillor Kenneth Hughes.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation with the condition set out in the written report.**

## **12.7 47LPA966/CC – Outline application for residential development together with the demolition of the former school on land at Ysgol Gynradd Llanddeusant.**

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that the Officers are recommending that consideration of the application be deferred to allow them appropriate time to consider the language assessment in connection with this application which has just recently been received.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes said that he was in favour of a deferral but for reasons of democratic renewal which is meant to ensure that the public who pay taxes and salaries have their say and be listened to. He added that he felt strongly that there is a duty on the Property Section to at least acknowledge that there is room for further discussions on this matter to seek a way forward that is acceptable to all parties.

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

## **13 OTHER MATTERS**

### **13.1 20C27D/2/CONS – Consultation for the de-commissioning of Wylfa A**

A report setting out a proposed response on behalf of the Authority on the Health and Safety Executive Consultation which makes observations on the current Nuclear Power Station at Wylfa was presented for the Committee's consideration.

The Chief Planning Officer informed the Committee that the Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR) an agency of the Health and Safety Executive and the enforcing authority on nuclear reactors is currently undertaking a formal consultation, and the Isle of Anglesey County Council as a consultee has been invited to comment on the application for decommissioning, and in particular on the Environmental Statement which contains the environmental impact assessment and mitigation measures to avoid or minimise significant impact on the environment.

Wylfa Nuclear Power Station obtained EIADR consent to decommission in March 2009 based on an Environmental Statement prepared in 2008 (the 2008 ES). The existing EIADR consent provided for the decommissioning project to commence within 5 years, but due to the extended generation Wylfa is not expected to shut down and begin decommissioning until 2015 by which time the current consent will have expired, and thus Wylfa is seeking a new consent.

As a consultee, the Council resolved in November 2008 to forward the comments as listed in the report to the Health and Safety Executive. The current consultation period began in May 2013 and the ONR requires comments by 9<sup>th</sup> August, 2013. The report sets out in detail consultation responses and reviews changes to the updated ES (March, 2013) and other material changes in circumstances. It also makes recommendations on matters which the Council consider that ONR should take into account as part of the EIADR consent process. These are detailed in section 12 of the report.

The Officer referred Members to the site map for Wylfa to illustrate what the three main stages of the decommissioning process will entail encompassing Care and Maintenance preparations; Care and Maintenance and Final Site Clearance.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes pointed out that there will be an increase in traffic through the village of Llanfachraeth and he was disappointed that no bypass route for Llanfachraeth had been taken into consideration.

The Planning Officer said that the development of the proposed new nuclear power station which will be an application made to the Welsh Government and the decommissioning of the current nuclear power station need to be differentiated. If the new nuclear power station proceeds then discussions have commenced with regard to providing a bypass for Llanfachraeth. The Officer said that he would be happy to include the observation made in the comments it is proposed are forwarded to the ONR.

**It was resolved to endorse the recommendations of the report as set out in section 12 with the addition of a comment in respect of consideration being given to the provision of a bypass route for the village of Llanfachraeth.**

### **13.2 34LPA982A/CC – Prior notification for the demolition of a building at the Stilts Building, Llangefni**

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that it was determined that the prior approval of the Local Planning Authority was not required for the above development and that it constituted permitted development. The matter is reported for information purposes only.

**It was resolved to note the report as information.**

### **13.3 38C185C – Full application for the erection of one wind turbine with a maximum hub height of up to 24.6m, rotor diameter of up to 19.2m and a maximum upright vertical tip height of up to 34.2m on land at Maes Mawr, Llanfechell**

*Having declared an interest in the application, Councillor Kenneth Hughes withdrew from the meeting and did not take part in the discussion thereon.*

The Planning Development Manager reminded Members that the site has now been visited by this Committee and that the Committee is asked to come to a resolution regarding the Authority's position in relation to the appeal. At its June meeting the Committee cited a number of reasons for wanting to refuse planning permission and these are considered and addressed individually in the report. The Officer's recommendation remains not to contest the appeal and, if the Planning Inspectorate is minded to approve the appeal, that it takes into consideration the conditions set out in the report. The appeal timetable has now been set and the Authority's statement is required by the 21<sup>st</sup> of the month; any comments received outside of that timeframe will not be accepted.

Councillor Victor Hughes said that whilst he did not object to smaller domestic wind turbines which provide renewable energy to farms he did not favour large scale wind turbines. He was however prepared to consider the current proposal on its own merits. He felt that the proposed development is fairly large and it is surrounded by dwellings. If he asked himself whether he would want to look at such a structure on a daily basis even though others can be seen on the horizon, the answer would have to be no. He could not be sure that it would affect the lives of those around it when they are in the open air or in their car for example. He pointed out that TAN 8 provides guidance and suggests that wind turbines should not be permitted to extend across the countryside. He asked whether this is a consideration in this case and whether it is a fact that the majority of people on the Island feel that a saturation point has now been reached.

Councillor Ann Griffith said that having visited the site she felt that the nearest dwellings are very close to the proposed turbine and that the photomontage did not provide an accurate reflection of what she saw on the site visit. She believed that the development would have a significant impact on the visual amenities of the area's residents. On that basis she opposed the application.

Councillor John Griffith as a Local Member said that the application site is within a distance of 500m to the nearest dwellings and that that should be taken into consideration as well as the current status of the SPG in relation to the size of the turbine and the separation distance from the nearest dwellings.

The issue of re-consulting on the SPG was raised. Councillor R.O.Jones believed it to be unfair to be considering applications for wind turbines without first having resolved the status of the SPG and specifically the provisions it makes with regard to separation distance between wind turbines and the nearest dwellings.

The Legal Services Manager explained that there would be implications for the Planning Policy section of re-consulting on elements of the SPG but given that six months have passed since the adoption of the SPG it is a matter on which the Council can make a further resolution. Whilst the SPG has been adopted by the County Council, the amendments made on the day of adoption have not been subject to public consultation and have therefore been accorded less weight by Planning Inspectors.

Following further discussion, the Chief Planning Officer said that he would discuss the matter of re-consultation with the Chief Executive and the Planning Policy Section.

Councillor Ann Griffith proposed that the Authority contest the appeal on the basis that the Committee would have refused the application due to its effects on visual amenity and because it runs contrary to the requirements of the SPG by virtue of its proximity to nearby dwellings. Councillor Victor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Councillors Ann Griffith, Victor Hughes and Nicola Roberts voted in favour of contesting the appeal.

**It was resolved to contest the appeal on the basis that the Committee would have refused the application due to its effects on visual amenity and because it is contrary to the requirements of the SPG by virtue of its proximity to nearby dwellings.**

The Development Control Manager indicated that pursuant to the Rules, Councillors Ann Griffith and Victor Hughes would be the ones to defend the decision on appeal.

*(Councillors Jeff Evans, Vaughan Hughes, Raymond Jones and Richard O. Jones did not vote on the matter as they had not been present on the site visit. Councillor John Griffith as a Local Member did not vote. Councillor W.T.Hughes did not vote on the matter for the reason that he owned a wind turbine)*

**Councillor W.T.Hughes  
Chair**