

Planning and Orders Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 1 May 2019

- PRESENT:** Councillor Nicola Roberts (Chair)
Councillor Richard Owain Jones (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors John Griffith, Glyn Haynes, Trefor Lloyd Hughes MBE, Kenneth Hughes, Vaughan Hughes, Eric Wyn Jones, Bryan Owen, Dafydd Roberts, Robin Williams
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Development Management Manager (NJ)
Development Management Team Leader (IWJ)
Planning Assistant
Development Control Engineer (JAPR)
Legal Services Manager (RJ)
Committee Officer (ATH)
- APOLOGIES:** None
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Members: Councillors Richard Dew (Portfolio Member for Planning (for application 12.1); Aled M. Jones (for application 7.3) G.O. Jones (for applications 12.1 and 12.4); Margaret Murley Roberts (for application 7.1) Ieuan Williams (for applications 7.1 and 12.2)
-

1 APOLOGIES

No apologies for absence were received.

2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were made as follows –

Councillor Eric Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 12.4

Councillor Richard Owain Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 7.3 stating that he would remain in the meeting for the discussion on the application in order to speak as a Local Member.

Mrs Nia Jones, Development Management Manager declared an interest in applications 12.5 and 12.6

Mr John Alwyn P. Rowlands, Development Control Engineer declared an interest in application 6.1

3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 3rd April, 2019 were presented and were confirmed as correct.

4 SITE VISITS

The minutes of the planning site visits held on 17 April, 2019 were presented and were confirmed as correct.

5 PUBLIC SPEAKING

The Chair announced that there would be a Public Speaker in relation to application 12.2.

6 APPLICATIONS THAT WILL BE DEFERRED

6.1 FPL/2018/52 – Full application for the erection of new changing rooms and club house for Holyhead Rugby Club at Holyhead Rugby Club, Bryn y Môr Road, Valley

As he had declared an interest in the application, the Development Control Engineer withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and determination thereof.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application has been called to the Planning and Orders Committee due to concerns about the development's relationship with adjacent residential properties and that the narrow road leading to the site is unsuitable for the potential increase in traffic. The Officer considers it would therefore be beneficial for Members to view the development on site before considering the planning application; a site visit is therefore recommended.

It was resolved that the application site be visited in accordance with the Officer's recommendation for the reason given.

7 APPLICATIONS ARISING

7.1 30C225K/ECON – Outline application for the siting of 25 holiday chalets together with leisure complex and associated access roads with some matters reserved at Treetops Country Club, Tyn y Gongl

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of two Local Members.

Councillors Margaret M. Roberts and Ieuan Williams both spoke as Local Members to re-emphasise the unacceptable impact of the proposed development on the area in terms of its effect upon the landscape, over provision of holiday accommodation, traffic and highways safety.

Councillor Ieuan Williams in describing how in his view the proposal is incompatible with Policy TWR 3 in leading to a significant intensification of the provision of this type of holiday accommodation in the area referred to the fact that from 600m to 1.5 km distance of the site there are 20 other such sites providing for 1,212 static caravans and 554 touring caravans. Planning permission has been granted for 9 chalets on an as yet undeveloped site at Lon y Glyn and at Storws Wen within 400m of the application site there is holiday village comprising of 30 holiday units. Farther out there are 6 static caravan sites around Pentraeth – Penrhyn Point, Traeth Bychan, Nant Bychan in Moelfre etc - making for in all,

5,000 static caravans. Benllech already suffers from an existing traffic problem with the square often gridlocked; there is concern about the square's capacity to deal with additional traffic. Speeding though Bwlch is also a problem. Moreover, housing developments that are either approved or in the pipeline will also add to the volume of traffic and on top of this are CLs (Certified Location) sites which are for a maximum 5 caravans which are also springing up in many areas. The new Planning Policy Wales places emphasis on sustainability and on taking a strategic view of planning in looking to the future. Councillor Williams said that he did not believe that a sufficiently holistic appraisal of the proposal had been made including its impact on the area and amenities beyond Benllech. Taking all provision into account including spaces at the GP Surgery which are available in the evenings and at weekends, there are 126 parking spaces in Benllech which are meant to serve 5,000 additional population in the summer. Councillor Williams concluded by saying that the proposal is contrary to policy in leading to over capacity of holiday accommodation in the area and he added that the test for assessing over capacity needs to be more specific in having regard to the actual volume of such accommodation in an area as well as the sensitivity of the landscape.

The Committee sought clarification of the Local Member of the reasons for not showing the video evidence of traffic in Benllech referred to at the Committee's previous meeting. The Committee also raised the issue of the economic benefit which tourists bring to Benllech and the surrounding area.

Councillor Ieuan Williams clarified that following an incident on Benllech Square involving a lorry the then Highways Technician made a film of traffic situation in Benllech Square. As the film evidence was taken on the Officer's phone and the Officer no longer works for the Council, then it cannot be shown. However, due to ongoing concerns about the traffic in and around the square in Benllech, a further survey will take place in the next week. With regard to the economic benefit of tourism, Councillor Williams said that whilst he agreed that tourism and the extra revenue it brings is important to the local economy, it must be provided for in sites that are appropriate and tasteful and not as in the current proposal where 25 holiday units are to be squeezed into a site that is more suitable for 10 units because that is more viable. According to the supplementary planning guidance, sites such as this should also be screened by the natural landscape and should not have need for any additional landscaping scheme. Because the application site is not sufficiently screened from the B5108 by the natural landscape a new landscaping screen is proposed which is contrary to the SPG. There is therefore a policy basis for rejecting the application.

The Development Management Manager reported that there is both support and opposition to the proposal locally as reflected by the statutory consultation process which has been carried out. A screening opinion has been issued which confirms that an Environmental Impact Assessment is not required. The Officer said that the applicant has now lodged an appeal on the basis of non-determination by the Local Planning Authority and, because of the nature of the application, the applicant is seeking a hearing as part of the appeal process. Once the appeal process has been validated the Local Planning Authority i.e. the Committee as the body to which the application has been referred, has four weeks to determine the application after which it will enter into an appeal situation where an appeal against refusal on the basis of non-determination within timescale will be heard. The application has been assessed against Policy TWR3 and the criteria therein as a result of which it is considered that the area is capable of accommodating the development. The key consideration is the Anglesey Sensitivity and Capacity Study. Paragraph 6.3.6.9 of the explanations to Policy TWR3 states that the study was commissioned to assess the capacity of an area to accommodate this type of development and is not about volume in terms of numbers but rather the capacity of the landscape to absorb developments such as this. This is the main consideration under the policy. A letter submitted by the applicant's agent provides clarification of why the application is for 25 units and not 10 on a 1 hectare

site (Table 2.1 of the Static Caravan/Chalet Park Development Typologies of the Anglesey, Gwynedd and Snowdonia National Park Landscape Sensitivity Study indicates that 10 units would be more acceptable on a 1 hectare site) and emphasises that this is an approximation. The study says *“that it is important to note that the report represents a strategic study and is not prescriptive at an individual site level. It does not replace the need for the Councils and Park Authority to assess individual planning applications for local landscape and visual impact assessment as part of formal EIA on a case by case basis”*. A strategic assessment has been made and the written report provides an assessment of the effects of the proposal on the landscape which are found to be acceptable. In economic terms the proposal provides for 20 jobs and in terms of sustainability the site is close to existing public transport links – two bus stops are located adjacent to the site and it is intended to create a new footpath and crossing as part of the application as well as a new access to the B5108 highway. Whilst Dwr Cymru is satisfied with the proposal the Council's Drainage section requests more information about water surface drainage and subject to the receipt of this information, the recommendation is one of approval.

The Committee in considering the application raised the following points –

- Whether it would be feasible for approval to be conditional upon no new chalets being built on the as yet undeveloped part of the site (the scheme providing for the concentration of the units on one part of the site).

The Development Management Manager said that details of the site layout are as submitted as part of the application. No amendments to the layout by way of additional chalets can be made without a statutory process being undertaken i.e. separate formal planning approval would have to be obtained for any additional units over and above those specified as part of this application.

- That in light of the case for over-capacity made by the Local Members whether it is premature to be determining the application ahead of the traffic survey which the Local Member indicated would be carried out next week.

The Development Management Manager said that the application has been assessed by the Highways Authority on the basis of what if any, increase in traffic the proposal and resulting use of the site might generate. A transport assessment has also been submitted as part of the application. The Officer advised that in light of a prospective appeal, it might be unwise for the Committee to defer determining the application pending the outcome of a traffic survey of the square at Benllech when the origins of the traffic on the square cannot be proven and where it could not derive from the proposed development as that does not exist currently. It would not therefore be possible to draw any conclusions from the survey about the proposal's effects on traffic; if there are traffic problems in the area as a whole it would have to be demonstrated that the proposed development adds materially to those problems in order for the proposal to be considered unacceptable and evidence of the same would have to be presented at appeal in order to justify refusal on those grounds.

- Whether the Highways Authority is satisfied that the capacity of the highways in and around the Benllech area is adequate to be able to deal with this kind of proposal.

The Development Control Engineer said a detailed transport survey has been presented as part of the application which finds that the proposed development will not lead to a material increase in traffic use over and above that which exists currently. Whilst the Highways Authority does have concerns about the capacity of the square in Benllech hence the traffic survey that will be undertaken this is a separate issue to the proposed development; the applicant should not be penalised for problems that already exist.

- That as the proposal is for 25 chalets in an area where the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study recommends 10 units per 1 hectare and as the proposal also provides for a leisure complex making it a sizable development and thereby increasing its visual impact and its impact on amenities, whether it contravenes Policy TWR 3 which states that *such proposals will only be granted if they are sited in an unobtrusive location which is well screened by existing landscape features and where the units can readily be assimilated into the landscape in a way which does not significantly harm the visual quality of the landscape, and can be refused on that basis.*

The Development Management Manager clarified that Policy TWR3 states that such proposals will only be granted if they are sited in an unobtrusive location which is well screened by existing landscape features and/or where the units can readily be assimilated into the landscape in a way which does not significantly harm the visual quality of the landscape. The Officer said that a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal which will mitigate any visual impact making it unobtrusive within its location and leading to no significant harm to the visual quality of the landscape.

Although some members of the Committee objected to the proposal because they considered it to be visually intrusive within its landscape and because they believed it would lead to an unacceptable intensification of such holiday provision within the area, the majority of the Committee's members were minded to approve the application because they concurred with the Officer's view that it meets policy requirements and because they deemed it to be economically advantageous to the area.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Bryan Owen. Councillor John Griffith proposed that the application be refused on the grounds of overcapacity and visual impact; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Vaughan Hughes. In the ensuing vote, the proposal to approve the application was carried.

It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein and subject also to the receipt of details regarding surface water drainage.

7.2 FPL/2018/57 – Full application for the erection of 46 dwellings together with the creation of a new vehicular access on land adjacent to Parc Tyddyn Bach, Holyhead

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee because it has been called in to committee by a Local Member.

The Development Management Manager reported that information in respect of drainage details is still awaited with regard to the proposal above and in addition, a policy issue has arisen this week in relation to the mix of units as part of the proposed development. The applicant has consequently requested that consideration of the application be deferred to allow time to respond to these matters.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be deferred as requested; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Richard Owain Jones.

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

7.3 FPL/2019/13 – Full application for the erection of an agricultural shed for the housing of livestock and the storage of machinery and fodder together with the

construction of a hard-standing access track on land adjacent to Telephone Mast, Nebo

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it has been called in for determination by the Committee by a Local Member.

As he had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application, Councillor Richard Owain Jones stood down as Vice-Chair but remained at the meeting in order to make representations as Local Member.

Councillor Richard Owain Jones said that the application is for a relatively small agricultural shed not dissimilar to a garage in a standard house and is located in a dip on Mynydd Eilian. From the shed's proposed location there is very little to see through to Porth Llechog on the coastline and the shed is certainly not visible from Porth Llechog. If the hedgerow near to road grows any higher it will be nearly invisible from the road. The applicant has also said that he would be willing to relocate the shed lower down in the field. In a discussion with the principal planning officer the latter suggested that the applicant site the shed near the sheds that are already on site. The applicant did not do so in order to better integrate the development within the site as is required by the JLDP. The planting scheme which it is intended will be carried out will mean gains in terms of biodiversity, ecology and environment and is to be welcomed as complying with Policy PCYFF 4. The general principle of development for agricultural purposes is accepted in local and national planning policies on condition that the development can be justified. Due to its location it is possible to justify the proposal because it is necessary to have a shed to keep farm machinery and fodder etc. safe and to provide shelter for the animals in bad weather. The site forms part of the old Anglesey radio station site with concrete block foundations – a network of cables still exists on the site. It is possible to argue that this is a commercial brownfield site with the applicant proposing to return the land to agricultural use in a way that is integrated with the landscape making it compliant with Policy AMG 2, 6.5.1 namely "*the aim of the SLA protection is to ensure that development proposals consider maintaining, enhancing or restoring the recognised character and quality of the area.*" Councillor Jones clarified that 16 SLAs have been identified for Gwynedd and Anglesey which include Mynydd Parys but not Mynydd Eilian which is the location of the proposed development. In conclusion, the site is near to but not located within the SSA and is not visible from the SSA; the shed is not in an obvious place, is not visible from the road and is therefore not a prominent feature on the landscape. The proposal is reasonable as regards size, location and use which is acceptable in relation to the JLDP and complies with Policy PCYFF 4 and AMG 2 6.5.1.

Councillor Aled Morris Jones referred to other features on the landscape in this area such as the windmill, radio mast, the former radio station and also six houses which are within a stone's throw of the proposed development. It was his opinion that these are far more prominent in terms of their "standing out" than the shed which is the subject of the application. Mynydd Parys which is within the SSA is a mile away from the development site. The development is intended to enable an individual from the locality to return to farming and to provide shelter for livestock and storage for farm vehicles. He asked the Committee to support the application.

The Committee sought clarification of how much livestock the applicant owns currently, and how much did he hope to acquire given that the shed is referred to as being akin to a garage in size.

Councillor Richard Owain Jones confirmed that the applicant did not have any livestock at present having avoided acquiring stock until the application for the shed had been determined; neither was the applicant in possession of any land elsewhere. Councillor Jones said that he did not know how many animals the applicant was intending to acquire.

The Development Management Manager reported that the applicant has 2.3 hectares of land and intends that the shed should house livestock, and provide storage for machinery and fodder. The applicant does not currently own any livestock and it is questionable how much machinery would be needed to maintain this amount of land. The application site lies within the Special Landscape Area of Mynydd Parys and adjoins the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It is considered that the site is within a prominent location and although adjacent masts are detracting features, it remains a sensitive location. The proposed shed measures 6 metres x 9.6 metres or just under 60m² in floor area; DEFRA guidelines stipulate 5 sheep per acre meaning that the shed would be sufficient for 30 sheep. However, no evidence or justification has been presented as part of the proposal to show that the building as proposed is necessary in terms of size, location and purpose in connection with an agricultural use, and because it would be intrusive within the landscape it is considered unacceptable with the recommendation therefore being one of refusal.

Councillor Eric Jones speaking from his experience as a farmer said that the Agriculture Ministry requires farmers to provide a place with appropriate facilities to treat animals e.g. when they undergo testing for various diseases. A shed is necessary for agricultural purposes to store fodder/produce and to provide shelter for the animals. The applicant's intention may be to keep animals over the winter which without a shed is not currently possible. In order to realise the full potential of the animals that are purchased, they must be kept for an additional year - a shed could potentially help the applicant achieve his expectations in terms of the price for his animals.

The Committee in considering the proposal and having heard the representations made by the Local Members indicated that it was minded to approve the application and that it accepted the need for the building for agricultural purposes as intended. The majority of the Committee further considered that in the context of other visibly prominent features on the landscape in the area of the application site, the proposed development would not cause any additional harm especially as landscaping is proposed as screening on the access and surrounding the building which would mitigate any visual effects. For these reasons, the Committee considered the proposal to be compliant with Policy CYFF4 and AMG2 of the Joint Local Development Plan.

Councillor Eric Jones proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Kenneth Hughes seconded the proposal.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation; the proposal was seconded by Councillor John Griffith.

In the ensuing vote, the proposal to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation was carried.

It was resolved to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation because it is deemed to comply with Policies CYFF4 and AMG2 of the JLDP.

In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution, the application was automatically deferred to the next meeting to allow Officers the opportunity to prepare a report on the reason given for approving the application.

8 ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS

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

9 AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS

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

10 DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS

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

11 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

11.1 HHP/2019/63 – Full application for the demolition of an existing garage together with alterations and extensions at Bryn Arfon, Lon Pant y Cydun, Benllech

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee because it is made by a Local Member which has a direct input into the planning process. In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution, the application has been scrutinised by the Council's Monitoring Officer.

The Development Management Manager reported that the subject dwelling is a two-storey semi-detached property with a detached garage to the side. The proposal involves demolishing the existing garage and erecting a two-storey extension to the side of the dwelling to provide a new garage, kitchen, breakfast room, living space and first floor office/storage space. It is the Officer's opinion that the scheme complies with all relevant policies and design guidance without unacceptably impacting any neighbouring properties as the separation distance of 9.8m between the proposed development and the adjacent property exceeds the recommended distance of 3.5m required by the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Bryan Owen proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Kenneth Hughes.

It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein.

11.2 HHP/2019/67 – Full Application for alterations and extensions at Glan Menai, Pen Lon, Newborough

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the applicants are officers of the Isle of Anglesey County Council, one of whom is employed in Development Control. In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution, the application has been scrutinised by the Council's Monitoring Officer.

The Development Management Manager reported that the proposal entails constructing an additional floor above the existing single storey extension in order to provide an additional bedroom and store. Although the property is situated within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty it is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of its design and effect on the designated area. Additionally, the scheme provides for high level windows so that overlooking of the neighbouring property which is 11m distance from the existing Glan Menai property, will not occur. The proposal is considered appropriate in this location in the AONB and has no unacceptable effect on the amenities of neighbouring properties nor on the area. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Office's recommendation; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Eric Jones.

It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein.

12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS

12.1 FPL/2019/51 – Full Application for the change of use of land for open storage of stone material ancillary to the primary use of funeral undertakers on land opposite Preswylfa, Valley

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it has been called in to the Committee by two Local Members.

Councillor Richard Dew speaking as a Local Member said that this was a straightforward application by a local undertakers' company to use the land to store materials relating to their trade and did not involve any new structure or building. The site is within a C2 Flood Zone and the only reason for the recommendation of refusal is on the guidance of Natural Resources Wales which advises that development in such areas should be resisted because of the risk of flooding. Councillor Richard Dew said that were the application site ever to be flooded then the likelihood is that the whole of Valley would also be under water. The risk is small and in this case being for business use, specifically storage of stone materials, the site is not as vulnerable as were it for residential purposes.

Councillor Gwilym O. Jones, also a Local Member explained that as the requirements of business has grown and the area it covers has expanded, the applicant needs more space to store stone materials there being insufficient storage space at the site at Preswylfa. Tyddyn Cob which is the principal defence for the town of Valley is at a distance of around 1.5 miles from the application site and close to Tyddyn Cob are the tidal doors which have been renewed in recent years. Councillor Jones referred to the land in between as inclining towards Valley and as also incorporating the railway and the A55. Councillor Jones said that reference had been made in a meeting at which he was present to Natural Resources Wales's flood maps as being "crude". He emphasised that if there were any doubts about the application, then Valley Community Council would have voiced them. Additionally, no objections to the proposal have been raised locally. He asked the Committee to support the application with appropriate conditions.

The Development Management Manager reported that whilst development proposals that are within a C2 Flood zone and are of a highly vulnerable nature cannot be supported, it is possible within policy to support development of a less vulnerable nature such as that proposed providing it complies with the criteria in paragraph 6.2 of TAN 15 – Development and Flood Risk. The proposal has been assessed against those criteria and a Flood Risk Assessment prepared by a professional practitioner on behalf of the applicant has been provided with the application in accordance with criterion (iv) of paragraph 6.2. The assessment finds that the proposal adequately addresses the flood risk associated with the failure of Tyddyn Cob. The Officer said that she was able to update the Committee that Natural Resources Wales opposes the development on the basis that the Flood Risk Assessment as submitted is inaccurate having referred to the ridge height of the tidal doors at Tyddyn Cob as 7 metres above ordnance datum whereas in reality the height is 4.4 metres. In addition, the Flood Risk Assessment relies on outdated breach analysis of Tyddyn Cob by utilising data from previous studies when more recent studies have been undertaken in connection with the Wylfa Newydd development. The proposal therefore fails to satisfy criterion (iii) as being on an agricultural field and not on previous developed land and criterion (iv) as the Flood Risk Assessment is technically inaccurate meaning no weight can be given to its findings because they are based on information that is incorrect. The recommendation is therefore to refuse the application.

The Committee sought clarification of whether it would be appropriate to place a condition on planning permission to prohibit the erection of a building on the site in future, and also whether the proposal is acceptable from a Highways perspective.

The Development Management Manager clarified that as the proposal does not involve the erection of any building, a condition prohibiting the same cannot be justified. The Development Control Engineer confirmed that Highways Service is satisfied with the proposal as regards visibility and adequacy of the turning space.

The Committee having considered the proposal and having heard the views of the Local Members was minded to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation because it deemed the risk of flooding to be small, and in accordance with criterion (iv) of TAN 15, it had considered the potential consequences of a flooding event for the particular type of development [in this case a less vulnerable commercial development] and in terms of the criteria contained in sections 5 and 7 and Appendix 1, had found them acceptable given that the site will be used for the storage of mainly stone materials. The Committee noted that that the proposal would not have any negative impact on the immediate surrounding properties.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes.

It was resolved to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation because it is deemed to comply with TAN 15 (iv).

In accordance with the requirements of the Council's Constitution, the application was automatically deferred to the next meeting to allow Officers the opportunity to prepare a report on the reason given for approving the application.

12.2 FPL/2019/31 – Full application for the conversion of an outbuilding into a holiday letting unit together with the installation of a new septic tank at Ty Mawr, Pentraeth

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it has been called in to the Committee by a Local Member.

Public Speaker

Mr Aled Davies spoke in favour of the application and said that he wished to convert the outbuilding into a holiday letting unit in order to diversify the business thereby making it more resilient. The proposed holiday cottage would be of the highest quality and with four bedrooms it could accommodate 8 to 10 persons. Investing in the conversion will bring revenue to the Island in the form of new visitors and will provide business for local builders, for local furnishers and local staff. Local businesses, local eateries, and local attractions would also benefit from more tourists staying for longer periods. The out building is part of a cluster of 4 buildings – 3 dwellings with the dwelling next-door being 5 metres away and having just received planning consent for demolition and re-build as a new modern house. Mr Davies said that the Council's Heritage Officer is happy with the proposal and that much time has been spent with a local architect to ensure that the proposal's design is sympathetic to its surroundings, the proposal retains the old outbuilding's walls and is on the same footprint. Mr Davies concluded by saying that he was confident that the business case for this enterprise is strong and that in supporting it, the Committee would also be supporting local business, local culture and the local heritage of an historic building.

The Committee questioned Mr Davies on the access to the application site in an emergency as it crosses Pentraeth beach and the Officer's report notes that it is not traversable at high tide. The Committee also raised the issue of the scale of the proposed converted building it being situated in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Mr Aled Davies said that occasionally at high tide during the Spring and Summer, it is necessary to have to wait for around 15 minutes for the tide to recede. The access track is at the top of the beach and it is rare not to be able to cross – in the past three families have lived in the bungalow, the farm and the chalet which is to be re-built as a new home. A 4 x 4 vehicle would have no problem in crossing in an emergency. The track is similar to a farm track in being a bit rough but not needing to be tarmacked. Some levelling work might need to be done if the track has been damaged after the winter. Mr Davies said that the Highways Officer had been with him to look at the site and that plenty of parking space is provided in the parking area.

In terms of the proposed development's visibility in the AONB, Mr Aled Davies said that the building cannot be seen from almost any point because the coastal path is situated to the rear and it is obscured by high trees and hedges. Looking from the Coastal Path, the chalet is the first in the line of sight, then the farm building, the farmhouse and then the bungalow. Only at a closer distance can they be seen and the intention is to provide additional screening. The proposed development would not be visible from the beach. As for the height of the building, the roof pitch has been designed in a way that it reduces but as the ground also falls away, two storeys can be accommodated. The two stables at the end are already tall and were two storeys in height anyway.

Councillor Ieuan Williams speaking as a Local Member said that after the original application was refused, the applicant has made changes to the scheme. The acceptability of the proposal hinges on the interpretation of what is an extensive extension as the principle of conversion into holiday accommodation is accepted under Policy TWR2. The footprint of the proposed converted building is no more than 2% to 3% larger than the footprint of the existing outbuilding (even though part of the building has been disregarded as existing footprint because it is not suitable for conversion) and there are examples where similar conversions have been approved e.g. in Llanfair yn cwmwd to the rear of Llanfair Hall, thereby setting a precedent for a two storey conversion. The Council's Heritage Officer finds the design both acceptable and compatible with its surroundings. What is ironic is that policy allows the next-door chalet bungalow to be demolished and a modern dwelling to be erected in its place whilst under conversion policy the proposed development is considered unacceptable even though it retains the character of the existing building and is supported by the Heritage Officer. Councillor Williams said that the proposal would not be visible and would not affect the amenities of anyone else and that he did not consider it excessive for its location. He added that he hoped that the Committee would be in a position to determine the application from the information presented at today's meeting, but if not, then it would be welcome to consider making a site visit.

Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes proposed that the Committee visit the application site so that Members can gain a better appreciation of the proposed development within its context; the proposal was seconded by Councillor John Griffith.

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

12.3 FPL/2019/9 – Full application for the demolition of the existing garages together with construction of a new car park, access road and turning area at Maes y Coed, Wood Street, Menai Bridge

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee because the application is made by the Isle of Anglesey County Council on County Council owned land.

The Development Management Manager reported that the application site which lies within the area designated as the Menai Bridge Conservation Area is currently a tarmacked area which includes a number of prefab style garages. The garages are unsightly and in a state of disrepair. It is considered that the proposal which entails demolishing the garages and creating 14 car parking spaces will improve the character of the area and create a more usable space for the occupiers of the nearby Maes y Coed Flats. The site is enclosed by trees some of which are the subject of a Tree Preservation Order, and although the scheme will involve the removal of some trees, conditions are proposed to protect the retained trees during the construction phase.

Councillor Robin Williams in supporting the proposal as a Local Member said that the existing garages on the site in their current state are an eyesore and are largely unusable; their demolition and the re-development of the site for the purpose proposed is to be welcomed. Councillor Williams therefore proposed that the application be approved; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Eric Wyn Jones.

It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein.

12.4 28C527B/VAR/ENF – Application under Section 73A for the variation of conditions (05) (access) and (10) (approved plans) of planning permission reference 28C527A (formation of a touring caravan site, erection of a shower block and creation of a new vehicular access) so as to amend the access, site layout and design of the shower block at Afallon Caravan Site, Llanfaelog

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

As he had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application, Councillor Eric Jones withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and determination thereof.

Councillor Gwilym O. Jones speaking as a Local Member said that although no representations have been made to the Planning Department, local residents have raised concerns about the development at the Community Council and consequently the Community Council is requesting that the site be visited as the application is retrospective. Among the concerns raised are the extra height of the shower block and the re-positioned site access.

Councillor Bryan Owen said that he did not think there was anything to be materially gained from visiting the site given that the Officers find the amenity block as built acceptable and he therefore proposed that the Committee should not visit the site; the proposal was seconded by Councillor John Griffith. In the ensuing vote the Committee endorsed not visiting the site.

Councillor Gwilym O. Jones further informed the Committee that a representative of the Community Council had wished to speak at the meeting but thought that a site visit should take place first. The Chair clarified that a request to speak at the meeting had been made but because it had not been submitted within time limits and in order not to set a precedent, she had not accepted the request.

The Development Management Manager reported that the application is retrospective and is to vary conditions (05) and (10) so as to amend the means of access to the site and to

amend the design of the shower block and site-reconfiguration. Although an application for a 25 pitch touring caravan site and the erection of a shower block on the site has been granted, the shower block that has been built differs from the approved scheme in being 1.4 metres higher to accommodate water storage tanks to serve the site; the access to the site has been re-located 10 metres farther to the south than the approved access, and the site has been re-configured so that the touring pitches under the amended scheme are set farther away from the boundary of the site with the nearest property known as Neuadd. The Highways Authority is of the view that there is no basis to refuse the application as the change to the access does not cause significant harm to highway safety and it is the Planning Officer's opinion that the re-design of the toilet/amenity block and the re-configuration of the site will not have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the surrounding properties nor the surrounding area. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Bryan Owen proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes.

It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein.

12.5 DIS/2019/20 – Application to discharge condition (14) (method statement setting out that all recommendations described in section 7 of the submitted Ecological Assessment report are adhered to and adopted) from planning permission 41LPA1041/FR/TR/CC full application for the change of use of agricultural land for use as a temporary stopping place (10 spaces) for Gypsies and Travellers, formation of a new vehicular access, the formation of a new pedestrian access and pavement together with associated development on land east of Star Crossroad, Star

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

As the Development Management Manager had declared an interest in the application, she withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and determination thereof.

The Development Management Team Leader reported that condition (14) was included in order to preserve and protect the ecological interests of the development site. An Ecology Method Statement has been received with the planning application which sets out all the recommendations described in section 7 of the Ecological Assessment. The Ecological Environmental Advisor has confirmed that the information is satisfactory and that the condition can therefore be discharged. As the information submitted is considered acceptable and meets the requirements of condition (14) of planning application 41LPA1041/FR/TR/CC, the recommendation is to approve the application.

Councillor John Griffith proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Vaughan Hughes.

It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report. (Councillors Bryan Owen and Robin Williams abstained from voting on this application)

12.6 DIS/2019/28 – Application to discharge condition (12) (supporting design calculations for the attenuated surface water drainage system) of planning permission 41LPA1041/FR/TR/CC full application for change of use of agricultural land for use as a temporary stopping place (10 spaces) for Gypsies and Travellers, formation of a new vehicular access, the formation of a new pedestrian access and

pavement together with associated development on land east of Star Crossroad, Star

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

As the Development Management Manager had declared an interest in the application, she withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and determination thereof.

The Development Management Team Leader reported that condition (12) was included in order to ensure that the application site is adequately drained. Drainage information has been received and it has been confirmed by the Drainage Section that the drainage strategy and plans appear sufficient to manage the surface water run-off from the proposed development. As the information submitted is considered acceptable and meets the requirements of condition (12) of planning application 41LPA1041/FR/TR/CC, the recommendation is to approve the application.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation; the proposal was seconded by Councillor Vaughan Hughes.

It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report. (Councillors Bryan Owen and Robin Williams abstained from voting on this application)

12.7 DIS/2019/24 – Application for the discharge of conditions (04) (Construction Traffic Management Plan), (06) (provision of affordable housing) and (07) (detailed plan for the communal garden) of planning application FPL/2018/4 (full application for the demolition of the existing garages together with the erection of 4 single person dwellings with associated parking at Maes yr Ysgol, Holyhead)

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

The Development Management Manager reported that the information submitted is considered acceptable and meets the requirements of conditions (04), (06) and (07) of planning application FPL/2018/4. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Vaughan Hughes.

It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's report and recommendation.

13 OTHER MATTERS

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

**Councillor Nicola Roberts
Chair**