

Planning and Orders Committee

Minutes of the virtual meeting held on 5 May 2021

- PRESENT:** Councillor Nicola Roberts (Chair)
- Councillors John Griffith, Glyn Haynes, T LI Hughes MBE, K P Hughes, Vaughan Hughes, Eric Wyn Jones, Dafydd Roberts, Ieuan Williams and Robin Williams.
- Councillor Richard A Dew – Portfolio Holder for Planning.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Development Management Manager (NJ), Senior Planning Officers (CR) & (GJ), Senior Engineer (Traffic and Parking) (AR), Development Management Engineer (Highways) (IH), Legal Services Manager (RJ), Committee Officer (MEH).
- APOLOGIES:** Councillor Richard O Jones
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Members : Councillors Carwyn Jones (application 7.1); Llinos M Huws (application 7.2); R Meirion Jones and Alun Mummery (application 11.1); J Arwel Roberts and Dafydd R Thomas (application 12.1).
- Councillors Gwilym O Jones, Bob Parry OBE FRAGS.
Mr Gareth W Williams (Local Democracy Reporter)

In the absence of the Vice-Chair, Councillor Robin Williams was elected to serve as Vice-Chair for this meeting only.

1 APOLOGIES

None received.

2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Eric Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 11.1.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 11.1.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 7 April, 2021 were presented and confirmed as correct, subject to the name of Councillor John Griffith being included in the members present at the meeting.

4 SITE VISITS

The minutes of the virtual site visit held on 21 April, 2021 were presented and were confirmed correct.

5 PUBLIC SPEAKING

There were public speakers in respect of applications 7.2 and 11.1.

6 APPLICATIONS THAT WILL BE DEFERRED

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

7 APPLICATIONS ARISING

7.1 FPL/2020/164 – Full application for conversion of the outbuilding into a holiday unit together with alterations and extensions thereto at Lleiniog Cottage, Penmon, Beaumaris

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At the meeting held on 3 March, 2021, it was resolved that a site visit was required. A virtual site visit was undertaken on 17 March, 2021. At the meeting held on 7 April, 2021 it was resolved to defer determining the application in order for the Committee to be provided with information about the visibility splays from the application site access.

The Chair read out a statement by Councillor Alun Roberts, a Local Member who was unable to attend the meeting as follows:-

Councillor Alun Roberts wished to thank the Highways and Planning Departments for dealing with issues regarding the access to the development site and noted that the amended plans are an improvement to the original plans submitted. However, there are still concerns regarding the road safety leading to the site from the Llangoed turning that leads to Penmon. Councillor Roberts expressed that the road is unfit for road users and especially pedestrian walking on the side of the road. The public footpath that leads along part of the road is in disrepair and is also flooded. Whilst accepting that the meeting was dealing with the application before the Committee, part of the development has a further two planning application with some part of the site under enforcement issues at present. Councillor Roberts noted he and the local community considered that it would be better to await the outcome of the enforcement issues on site before the Committee makes a decision on this application.

Councillor Carwyn Jones, a Local Member said that he agreed with the statement present by his fellow Local Member as regards to this application. He noted that the application site is a sizeable holiday development and he considered that one composite application should have been submitted rather than a piecemeal step by step applications. Councillor Jones expressed that there are highways safety issues that are of local concerns as regards to the development.

The Development Management Manager reported that the application was deferred at the last meeting in order for the Committee to be provided with information regarding the visibility splays from the application site access. She noted that the Highways Authority has confirmed that the site access is acceptable with regards to the development on site. There were no representations received following the publicity process as regards to the application however there has been local concerns conveyed through the Local Members and by the Community Council. A letter has been submitted by the applicant in support of his application. She further said that the application site is located in open countryside in a designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The subject outbuilding is listed by virtue of being a curtilage building located to the rear of the principal Listed Building, Lleiniog Manor. The local community's concerns regarding activities on the site including work on structures which may require listed building consent are acknowledged and these are being investigated through enforcement but there is no confirmation at present that there have been breaches of planning controls on site. Whilst accepting that there are other applications relative to the site currently in process, each application must be considered individually and on its own merits. Policy TWR2 which deals with holiday accommodation states that proposals will be permitted provided that they are of a high quality in terms of design, layout and appearance and conform to the relevant policy criteria. It is considered that the proposal accords with the provisions of Policy TWR2 and that it is in a sustainable location; neither is it considered that the development will give rise to an unacceptable impact upon the character and appearance of the listed building and designated AONB. Listed Building consent for this development has been granted and the recommendation is of approval of the application.

Councillor K P Hughes said that the Local Members have expressed the local concerns as regards to this application. However, the concerns of the Committee was regarding the highways safety and mainly as to whether the access to the site conformed to the required visibility splay. The applicant has provided evidence that the visibility distances are in excess of the minimum standards required. The Highways Authority raises no objection to the application and Councillor K P Hughes proposed that the application be approved subject to that the widening of the access to the site be completed before any other works continue on the site. Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal.

It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's report subject to the conditions contained within the written report together with an additional condition that the widening of the

access to the site be completed before any other works continue on the site.

7.2 FPL/2021/10 – Retrospective application for the erection of a garage on land adjacent to Bron Castell, Llanfairynghornwy

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member due to concerns within the local community about the scale, location and design of the garage.

Public Speaker (Objector)

Ms Alys Haf said that Bron Castell is owned by her mother and has been a family home for the family since 1900. She referred to her mother's serious illness in 2015 and what kept her going was the idea and dream that she could return to the home she was born at Bron Castell, Llanfairynghornwy and to be nearby to all her family in the village. Ms Alys Haf said that following several planning applications to build a house and garage on the nearby site her family were pleased that a Welsh family could build a home in the village. However, it was realized that the applicants had not complied with the plans and had decided to breach their planning permission. It was a shock to see not only the location of the garage, but the size of the garage which has been erected so close to the patio at Bron Castell. It's heartbreaking, especially as this is the only place in the garden where a patio can be located due to the layout of the land; the location of the garage is having a detrimental impact on privacy and casts an unacceptable new shadow. This location was the only area that was exposed enough to receive the most sunshine into the garden at Bron Castell but now this has been taken away without consultation. She noted that 5 conditions of the original permission have been breached :-

- The garage has been moved 10 metres back in the site which is having a negative impact;
- A floor has been added, making it a two storey garage which again has an impact on the sunlight into the garden at Bron Castell;
- A large window has been added facing onto the patio in Bron Castell which is having a detrimental impact on privacy.
- The garage is 0.4 metres wider, which casts a shadow and it is 0.9 metres;
- Two skylight windows have been erected which is facing Mynydd y Garn.

Ms Alys Haf further said that the planning application now states their reason for relocating the garage is to have room to move cars, but it is important to note that the plot size is large enough to give plenty of options for the location of the garage. The planning officer's report before this Committee recommends three conditions but these conditions do not change the effect on her family at Bron Castell. The garage erected has darkened the patio and garden. Human Rights law has established the right of individuals to enjoy their property quietly without any intrusion from their neighbours. Following case law it can establish that invasion of privacy constitutes disrupting enjoyment of property.

Councillor John Griffith questioned whether the applicants had discussed with the neighbouring property that they intended to re-position the garage on land adjacent to Bron Castell. Ms Alys Haf responded that the applicants had not discussed their intentions to move the location of the garage on the site. She noted that in July 2020 they became aware that the siting of the garage was contrary to the plans approved.

Public Speaker (applicant)

Mrs Elen Pritchard said that as a family they were delighted to have had the opportunity to build a new home at land adjacent to Bron Castell, Llanfairynghornwy with the support of Councillor Llinos Medi Huws, one of the local members and Cylch y Garn Community Council. However, the relief and joy at the time was short lived when Ms Pritchard became seriously ill. When she became better one of the first things was to start work on their new home. The first stage of the work was to open a new access from the front of the field and open the foundations of the house itself, which involved digging hundreds of tonnes of land. In due course a foundation was opened for the garage. In reviewing the plans it was soon realized that the original location for the building would not leave enough room to pass a car between the house and the garage which meant that there was no suitable place for turning and parking a car and it would need to have to reverse into the public highway below to exit the site. It was decided that there was a simple solution and that moving the garage back from its original position would solve the problem. Mrs Pritchard expressed that they were not aware that further planning permission was required and certainly did not consider that it would raise any objections from their neighbours at Bron Castell, or those who had been so supportive previously. She expressed that it came as a shock to receive an official letter from Anglesey Council's Planning Service stating that a complaint had been made against them (by the owner and resident of Bron Castell) about the location of a window which had not been included in the original design of the garage. Of course they were very keen to work with the Authority and came up with a suitable solution as can be seen within the Planning Officer's report. Unfortunately this was not the end of the matter when a further complaint was made regarding the location of the garage on this occasion. Again they fully complied with the Authority explaining the reasoning for the change of location and for not consulting with them in the first instance and presented all the documentation needed to satisfy the situation.

Ms Pritchard further expressed that it was regrettable that in due course it was felt that their decision was having an adverse effect on their neighbours' dwelling at Bron Castell. With this information, efforts were made to try and make contact with the owner of Bron Castell some months ago, in the summer of 2020, to try to discuss the matter amicably. Efforts were made through another neighbour from the area to leave contact details with the owner but unfortunately no response was received. She noted that it was a relief to receive the recent report from the Planning Service which accepts the practical reasons for moving the garage and confirms that the development complies with the relevant planning policies and as

applicants they would be accept and comply the conditions set out in the Planning Officer's report.

Councillor John Griffith questioned whether as applicant's they had considered that the siting of the garage would have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring property of Bron Castell as the garage is substantially larger in size to what was approved originally. He further referred that the development site is large enough to accommodate the garage near the new dwelling. Mrs Pritchard said that the original location of the garage would have been located on the boundary of Bron Castell but she considered that the size of the garage is not substantially larger than that was approved originally; the current location of the garage is now further away from the boundary and it was not considered that it would have a detrimental effect on the residents of Bron Castell but in hindsight planning permission should have been sought. Mrs Pritchard agreed that the size of the plot is large enough to accommodate the garage nearer the new dwelling but it was considered that enough space was required for the passing of cars on the site.

Councillor Robin Williams questioned whether the applicant's had professional builders to erect the dwelling and garage on site and whether they had advised that planning permission would be needed for the re-siting of the garage. Mrs Pritchard responded that they had employed professional builders to built the dwelling and garage but they did not advise that planning permission would be needed for the re-siting of the garage. Councillor Dafydd Roberts questioned whether an Architect was employed to design the development on site. Mrs Pritchard said that the Architect was employed when the design of the new garage was required in respect of the windows and skylights. Councillor Robin Williams questioned as to the reason such a large window was required in a garage which is facing the neighbouring property. Mrs Pritchard responded that a large window was required to allow daylight to come into the garage as the garage is to be also for storage area within roof space as the roof space in the dwelling has attic trusses with a potential of bedroom space if required.

Councillor Llinos M Huws, a Local Member said that she had supported the application for a dwelling on the site in 2016 for the applicants to be able to erect a home but it was important to note this application is a retrospective application as regards to the erection of a garage on the land. She noted that there is planning legislation that safeguards the amenities of people and to be able to comment on the planning process when people are affected by such developments. She referred to the planning officer's report which noted that the size of the garage is larger than the original approval and it was originally supposed to be erected near a shed at Bron Castell; the garage casts a shadow over the neighbouring property; a window has been placed in the garage which is unacceptable due to overlooking when anyone sit in the garden of the neighbouring property Bron Castell. Councillor Llinos M Huws further said that when planning applications are submitted for appeal, privacy and loss of light on neighbouring properties are important matters that are taken into consideration by the Planning Inspectorate and she did not consider that the planning officer's report has addressed these matters. She further said that it is accepted that the applicants and the residents of Bron Castell

have had personal health issues but it must be considered that a garage has been built in the incorrect position and is having a negative impact on the neighbouring property. The Community Council and local residents are also against the retrospective application before this meeting.

Councillor John Griffith, a Local Member said that there is a substantial change in the application that was originally approved. The garage is located 10 metres further back from its approved location and the dimensions had also changed such that it measured 6.8 metres by 6.8 metres within the curtilage and the scale of the garage is now different. The garage is also much closer to the neighbouring property Bron Castell. He further said that the applicant's should have considered that planning permission was required to change the original plans and they have not consulted the owners of Bron Castell. He said that during the virtual site visit it was obvious that the size of the garage is immense compared to the size of Bron Castell; the window and access to the garage will have a detrimental effect on the amenities and privacy of the neighbouring property. The application site is considered to be ample to be able to accommodate a garage which would not have impacted on the neighbouring property. Councillor Griffith referred to planning policy PCYFF 2 of the Joint Local Development Plan that planning permission will be refused where a development would have a negative impact on health, safety and amenities of local residents.

Councillor K P Hughes, a Local Member said that both families have relatives that have lived within the community of Llanfairynghornwy for a number of years. However, the original planning application was approved against the recommendation of the planning officer's to allow a family to return to the area to live and raise a family. However, the application before the Committee is a retrospective application to keep the garage which has not been built in the correct position on the site. Councillor Hughes said that he did not agree with the planning officer's report that the location of the garage would not impact adversely upon the character of the designated landscape nor upon the amenities of the neighbouring property to such a degree to warrant refusal of the application. He said that the site is a substantial plot and there is ample space for the erection of a garage without affecting the amenities of the residents of Bron Castell. Councillor K P Hughes proposed that the application be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

The Development Management Manager reported that a virtual site visit to the site showed the layout and position of the garage on site. She said that in dealing with a retrospective application the proposal must be considered within its planning merits and the planning process does not penalize applicants that have not submitted planning applications in the first instance. The garage is slightly larger than that was originally approved with an increase of 0.4m in both length and breadth together with an increase in ridge height of 0.9m to 5.9 metres. The distance to the boundary of Bron Castell has also been increased by 0.3m to 1.9 metres. There is a slight change in terms of appearance of the garage which includes a second floor attic space and ground floor window on the northern site, a first floor window on the front elevation (western side) and two skylights on the southern aspect roof plane. The Development Management Manager said that a

condition is imposed within the Officer's report that obscure glass is to be placed in the window facing the neighbouring property in order to ensure that there is no overlooking and it would also be a non-opening window. The recommendation is of approval of the application.

Councillor Vaughan Hughes expressed his dissatisfaction as regards to retrospective applications and he agreed with the Local Member, Councillor John Griffith that there is a substantial change in the application that was originally approved. He expressed that he totally disagreed with the recommendations within the Planning Officer's report and he seconded the proposal of refusal of the application.

It was RESOLVED to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was considered that the development has adverse effect on the neighbouring property and is contrary to planning policy PCYFF 2.

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

10.1 VAR/2020/76 – Application under Section 73 for the variation of condition (02) of appeal decision ref APP/L6805/A/17/3167404 (Erection of a dwelling) so as to amend the location of the dwelling and vehicular access on land adjacent to Brynteg, Llansadwrn

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the proposal is contrary to policies of the Joint Local Development Plan which the Local Planning Authority is minded to approve.

The Development Management Manager reported that application is made under Section 73A and relates to an approved open market dwelling house and is contrary to development plan policies. The principle of a dwelling has already been established in this location under appeal decision and permission remains as extant. However, since the adoption of the Joint Local Development Plan, Llansadwrn is now identified as a cluster under planning policy TAI 6 of the JLDP where any new dwelling must be for affordable local need on an infill site but nevertheless a fallback position exists as the site

benefits from an extant permission which is capable of being implemented. She noted that no representations received following the publicity period of the amended application. It is considered that the proposed amendments are considered to be acceptable and represent an overall improvement to the previously approved plans.

The Development Management Manager referred that Condition 1 within the Officer's report need to be amended that the development shall begin no later than 11 May, 2022 to comply with the permission that already exist. An additional condition will need to be imposed preventing implementation of the original permission if the amended application is approved to assure that only one dwelling can be built on the application site.

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

It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's report and recommendation subject to the conditions contained therein, together with an additional condition preventing implementation of the original permission.

11 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

11.1 FPL/2020/98 – Retrospective application for the retention of engineering works creating a hard standing surface for agricultural storage use and permitted development use as a carboot site together with the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access on land at Cae Prytherch, Llanfairpwll

Councillor Eric Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts declared a personal interest in the application and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon.

The Chair sought legal advice as the applicant is an elected member whether the members needed to declare an interest. The Legal Services Manager responded that it does not constitute an interest under the Code if the applicant is an elected member nor if a member is a member of the same political group or a member for the same electoral ward.

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the applicant is an elected member. The application has been scrutinised by the Monitoring Officer as required under paragraph 4.6.10.4 of the Constitution.

Public Speaker (applicant's agent)

Ms Sioned Edwards said that the application before you involves the retention of engineering works to create a hardstanding on the site in order to enable

the site to be used for two purposes; namely for agricultural storage and for carboot sales. The application also seeks permission to retain the alterations made to the access. It should be clear that this application does not involve change of use of the land at all - only laying the hardstanding. The proposed site has been used for carboot sales with the sale being popular locally. Previously, the site has been used for a car boot sale for up to 14 days a year under general permitted development rights. As the site tends to be wet, the site needed to be improved to be fit for purpose and so a hardstanding was provided in order to ensure that the site was suitable for the users and visitors, and also to ensure that no mud from the site was carried to the nearby highway. Creating a site that is suitable and safe for all users is extremely important. The Officer's report states that retaining the hardstanding to provide a fit for purpose carboot site is unreasonable. While the site has not been in use for the duration of the pandemic, new temporary permitted development rights to support economic recovery as a result of Coronavirus now permit the site to be used for up to 28 days in a year. This would be the applicant's intention once the Coronavirus guidelines permit. This was a means of diversification for the applicant, enabling him to provide a car boot sale in an accessible and sustainable location on the outskirts of Llanfairpwll, making better use of the site. Since the end of 2019, the applicant has paid business rates of over £6,000 a year to the Council to use the site with a hardstanding. Concern has been raised that the existing on-site screening is not sufficient to mitigate the visual impact of the hardstanding. However, the applicant has already offered to provide a wider landscaping scheme and the officer stated during the application that this scheme can be submitted and approved as part of a planning condition. The visual impact can therefore be mitigated and the Council would be able to manage this scheme by imposing a condition on the permission. Reference is made in the report that the hardstanding has a detrimental impact on the character of the landscape as it is in an open countryside location. Whilst the site lies outside the development boundary, it directly adjoins the boundary and the developed part of Llanfairpwll and is in a sustainable location.

Councillor R Meirion Jones, a Local Member expressed that he was presenting the observations of the local residents and the electorate he represents and also as member of the Llanfairpwll Community Council who have objected to this development on the site. He noted that the electorate is under the impression that an Elected Member is trying to taking advantage of the planning process that they are having to comply to. The applicant is a member of the Planning and Orders Committee and has received training as regards to planning policies. Councillor R Meirion Jones further said that the Councils Constitution refers at 2.2.3.1.6 that Elected Members should maintain the highest standards of conduct and ethics. He further said that since the Summer of 2019 this application received objections and astonishment within the local community as the applicant altered the land at Cae Prydderch which was agricultural land without consultation with the Planning Officer's nor attaining planning approval. Enforcement procedures were undertaken by the Local authority to cease works on the site and to restore the land but the applicant appealed the decision in respect of the time given to comply with the notice but he did not contest any other element of the

Planning Enforcement Appeal. The time for compliance was within three calendar months following the date the notice took effect with the notice taking effect on 17 February, 2020. The Planning Inspectorate following receipt of the appeal allowed and extension from the three calendar months to six months and in the meantime a retrospective application was submitted to the Planning Authority.

Councillor R Meirion Jones referred that a local resident complied a traffic survey recently which resulted in 88 vehicles passing the site within quarter of an hour and a further 95 vehicles passed the site during another period of quarter of an hour. He noted that if this application was to be approved it would open the floodgates for other owners of land to convert their land to similar activities as this application. He referred to the retrospective application to widen the access to the site and local residents consider that the visual appearance is similar to an industrial access. Councillor Jones further said that he disagreed with the comments made by the public speaker that the carboot sale convened on the site had been popular. He asked the Committee to refuse the retrospective application before the Committee.

Councillor K P Hughes proposed that the application site be visited due to local concerns as is noted within the Planning Officer's report. The proposal of a site visit was not seconded.

The Development Management Manager reported that this is a retrospective application for the retention of engineering works creating a hard standing surface for agricultural storage use and permitted development use as a carboot site together with the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access on land at Cae Prytherch, Llanfairpwll. She referred to the enforcement investigation and site history as noted within the Planning Officer's report and the Planning Enforcement Notice – Reasons for issuing the notice' The Enforcement Notice did not include the access to the site as it was deemed to be acceptable. Following the appeals as regarding to the period of compliance of the Enforcement Notice of three months the Planning Inspectorate extended the period to six months which required the land to be reinstated into its former use by December 2020. In the meantime a retrospective application was submitted to the Planning Authority to retain the works undertaken on the site. She noted that in accordance with the usual arrangements the Enforcement Section does not enforce the enforcement notice whilst a retrospective application is being determined.

The Development Management Manager further said that under the planning procedures retrospective application are not penalised and the aspect of the application is considered within its merit as is with any other planning applications. The application site has been used for a car boot sale for up to 14 days a year under general permitted development rights. The Development Management Manager said that Welsh Government has extended the period of for carboot sales to be held on land from 14 days to 28 days a year (between 31 April, 2021 and 3 January, 2022) under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (as amended)

She noted that planning permission is required to create a hard surface to facilitate the use of the land and the improvements to the access to the site which is under consideration by this Committee. There are no objections to the improvement to the access to the site by the Highways Authority as it is considered that it improves accessibility and safety when entering and leaving the site; the access to the site has not been part of the Enforcement Notice. However, the hard surface is considered to be overdevelopment of the site and does not enhance the character or appearance of the site and the scale of the development covering the whole site in a hard surface is excessive for its intended uses. The recommendation is to refuse the retention of the engineering works to create a hard surface on the site and to approve the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access to the site.

Councillor T LI Hughes MBE questioned whether there is evidence that the land tends to be wet as has been expressed by the public speaker. The Development Management Manager responded that the land has been designated as C2 flood zone; a flood assessment report has been submitted as part of the application which was considered acceptable. Councillor T LI Hughes MBE further questioned whether a recommendation can be split as the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access is considered acceptable. The Development Management Manager stated that the access has been improved as regards to visibility and the appearance is acceptable and it is considered to be an improvement to the use of the access to the site. The alterations made to the vehicular access are considered reasonable and comply with local and national planning policies. The hardstanding part of the application is only considered unacceptable.

Councillor Robin Williams a member of the Committee and a Local Member said he accepted that the alterations made to the vehicular access is an improvement in respect of visibility. However, he said that a substantial industrial gate has been erected on the entrance to the site which does not fit into the landscape and neither into the locality and he did not consider that such an industrial gate was suitable for an agricultural field. Councillor Robin Williams proposed that both the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access and the retention of the engineering works to create a hard surface be refused in accordance with planning policies PCYFF 2 and PCYFF 3.

Councillor T LI Hughes MBE seconded the proposal of refusal of both aspects of the application.

Councillor John Griffith proposed that the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access to the site be approved and that the retention of the engineering works to create a hard surface be refused as is recommended within the Officer's written report. Councillor Glyn Haynes seconded the proposal.

The vote was as follows:-

To refuse both the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access to the site and the retention of the engineering works to create a hard surface :-

Councillors T LI Hughes MBE, Vaughan Hughes, Ieuan Williams and Robin Williams **TOTAL 4**

To approve the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access to the site and to refuse the retention of the engineering works to create a hard surface :-

Councillors John Griffith, Glyn Haynes and K P Hughes **TOTAL 3**

Abstained from voting : Councillor Nicola Roberts **TOTAL 1**

It was RESOLVED:-

- **To refuse the retention of the engineering works to create a hard surface on site in accordance with the Officer's recommendations as outlined in the written report;**
- **To refuse the retention of the alterations made to the vehicular access to the site as being contrary to policies PCYFF 2 and 3 contrary to the Officer's recommendation.**

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

12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS

12.1 FPL/2021/38 – Full application for the sitting of 2 glamping pods together with the creation of a new access and associated development on land adjacent to Gwel y Môr, Trearddur Bay

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

Councillor J Arwel Roberts, a Local Member said that the address of the application needs to be amended as the property is sited in Penrhosfeilw, Holyhead. Councillor Roberts requested that the Committee carry out a virtual site visit of the application site.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that a virtual site visit be undertaken of the site and Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal.

It was RESOLVED to conduct a virtual site visit in accordance with the Local Member's request.

13 OTHER MATTERS

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

**COUNCILLOR NICOLA ROBERTS
CHAIR**