

# Planning and Orders Committee

## Minutes of the hybrid meeting held on 11 January 2023

- PRESENT:** Councillor Neville Evans (Chair)  
Councillor Glyn Haynes (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors Geraint Bebb, Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE, John I. Jones, R. Llewelyn Jones, Jackie Lewis, Dafydd Roberts, Ken Taylor, Robin Williams.
- Local Members: Councillors Arfon Wyn (for application 7.1), Aled M. Jones, Derek Owen (for application 7.2), Llinos Medi (for application 7.5)
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Development Management Manager (RLJ)  
Group Engineer (Development Control and Traffic Management (AR)  
Legal Services Manager (RJ)  
Committee Officer (ATH)
- APOLOGIES:** Councillors Jeff Evans, Liz Wood
- ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor Nicola Roberts (Portfolio Member for Planning, Public Protection and Climate Change), Senior Planning Officer (SOH), Planning Officer (HR)
- 

Prior to commencing the business of the meeting, the Chair paid tribute to the late Councillor Alun Mummery who passed away shortly before Christmas; he praised his contribution over many years to the Council, to his community and to the Island and beyond.

### 1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were noted as listed above.

### 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Neville Evans declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 7.2 on the agenda on the basis that he was relative of the applicant and his brother had been in the applicant's employment.

Councillor Glyn Haynes declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 12.10 on the agenda as a school governor of Ysgol Llanfawr and because his daughter was employed as a teacher at the school.

### 3 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meetings of the Planning and Orders Committee held on the following dates were presented and were confirmed as correct:

- 7 December, 2022
- 15 December, 2022 (adjourned from 7 December, 2022)

#### **4 SITE VISITS**

The minutes of the site visits held on 20 and 21 December, 2022 were presented and were confirmed as correct.

#### **5 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

There were Public Speakers in respect of applications 7.3 and 12.7.

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

##### **6.1 FPL/2022/60 – Full application for the erection of 14 dwellings together with the creation of an internal access road and associated works on the former site of Newborough School, Pen Dref Street, Newborough**

The Development Management Manager advised that as the Local Planning Authority is awaiting further highway information from the applicant, the Officer's recommendation is that the application be deferred.

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

#### **7 APPLICATIONS ARISING**

##### **7.1 HHP/2022/230 – Full application for alterations and extensions at Dinas Bach, 5 Ystad y Fron, Aberffraw**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders having been called in by a Local Member because of local concerns. At its meeting held on 7 December, 2022 the Committee resolved to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the basis that the proposal was deemed to be contrary to Policy PCYFF 2 of the Joint Local Development Plan due to its impact upon the amenity of the adjacent residential property as a result of the proximity of the development and non-compliance with the indicative minimum distances noted in the Supplementary Planning Guidance, and because of parking issues.

The Development Management Manager said that the Officer's report addresses the reasons cited for the Committee's decision to refuse the application at its previous meeting. With regard to impact upon amenity, it is recognised that the new single storey side extension will be 0.8m wider than the existing garage which it will replace and will therefore become 0.8m closer to the boundary with neighbouring 4 Y Fron. However, given that a degree of overlooking between neighbouring properties exists at present, and is a natural feature of living in a built up residential area, Officers have to assess whether the proposal's impact on amenity would be worse than that which already exists. To prevent overlooking, the applicant proposes erecting a 1.95m timber fence on part of the boundary and although this is considered permitted development, it will be a conditioned part of the plans. The proposed extension's side elevation facing 4 Y Fron will include a bedroom window, a bathroom window and a door opening into the utility; it is considered that adequate measures have been taken and appropriate conditions set i.e. the erection of a fence and use of obscure glazing to protect the privacy and amenities of the neighbours at

4 Y Fron. It is considered that these measures will prevent overlooking between the two properties thereby protecting the privacy and amenities of the neighbours in line with Policy PCYFF 2.

In relation to parking, as a four bedroom property three parking spaces must be provided to comply with the requirements of the Highways Authority. The proposed site plan shows three parking spaces as well as additional spaces for more vehicles if needed in compliance with the Highways Authority's parking standards and policy TRA 2. Concerns raised during the consultation period regarding parking issues on the Y Fron estate is a separate matter for the Highways Authority and will be dealt with separately to the application. The Highways Authority has raised no objections to the application as presented. The Officer's recommendation therefore remains one of approval.

The Development Management Manager further advised that should the Committee be minded to adhere to its previous decision to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation, it may lead to the Committee having to defend the decision at appeal with the potential for resulting costs.

Councillor Arfon Wyn speaking as a Local Member questioned whether anything had changed since the application was refused at the previous meeting. He referred to Welsh Government powers to stop residential homes being changed into holiday homes without planning permission and thought that the Council should be following the spirit of the proposed new legislation to prevent such change of use. He spoke about his concerns that the property would become a holiday home given the proposed alterations and extensions which would represent a significant change of use especially in an estate where the properties are local residents' main homes. He believed the development to be contrary to policy TWR 2 of the JLDP which states that holiday homes should not lead to the loss of permanent housing stock nor should they be located in a primarily residential area; neither should they harm the residential character of an area. He said that should the proposal go ahead, it would mean both the loss of another dwelling in Aberffraw which could have been a family home and a loss to the housing stock. He also believed that the Planning Authority had not given sufficient consideration to the views and objections of the community council and local people especially as 33 letters of objections had now been submitted. He referred to the clear planning issues involved including the proximity of the proposal to the neighbouring property in contravention of the minimum distances noted in the SPG which has not been given sufficient weight, and the unsuitability of the development in terms of character and appearance making it stick out like a sore thumb. He believed the proposed development would have an impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents and that according to the JLDP and SPG such a development should not occur on a residential street which already suffers from parking issues. The scheme further shows that the development will exceed the existing building line which is also contrary to the SPG. Councillor Arfon Wyn questioned the point of such plans if they are not followed saying that he and his fellow councillors were elected to protect their communities, to stop their decline and becoming filled with holiday homes.

The Development Management Manager highlighted that the application is to extend the existing property which as a residential property is Use Class C3; under current planning legislation planning permission is not required for the use of C3 dwelling house as a holiday let which means that policy TWR 2 does not therefore apply in this case. The applicant has worked with the Planning Authority over the course of a year to bring forward a scheme that is acceptable, and it should be noted that the distance between the existing garage and the neighbouring property is also less than the indicative minimum distance set out in the SPG, and although the replacement extension will be 0.8m closer to 4 Y Fron, it is the Officer's view that the impact will not be any greater than at present. The Development Management Manager assured the Committee that while the Planning Authority respects

the views of community councils and all other representations made, Officers must have regard of the relevant planning considerations.

Councillors Ken Taylor and Robin Williams although both were sympathetic to the views of the Local Member and to the local concerns, believed that the application had to be considered as presented and on that basis they felt there were no policy grounds for refusing the proposal. Councillor Ken Taylor did not think that the extension in being 0.8m closer to the neighbouring property would materially affect the amenity of that property; on-site parking provision was considered acceptable and wider parking problems on the estate were not a matter for the Committee. That being so, Councillor Ken Taylor proposed, seconded by Councillor Robin Williams that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor John I Jones referred to the objections made which he thought should carry due weight having risen from 19 to 33; he highlighted the relevance of policy PCYFF 2 in this instance especially in relation to the element of nuisance. Regardless of the fact that the proposed side extension will only be 0.8m closer to the neighbouring property, the proposal does not comply with the SPG on minimum separation distances and the configuration of the 3 parking spaces at the front of the property also makes exiting the site safely onto the road difficult. Councillor John I Jones proposed, seconded by Councillor Geraint Bebb that the Committee's previous refusal of the application be reaffirmed.

Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE queried any light impact on the neighbouring property but was otherwise supportive of the application. Councillor R. Llewelyn Jones emphasised the importance of preserving communities.

The Legal Services Manager sought clarification whether the reasons for refusal remained the same as those put forward at the last meeting specifically with regard to parking; he advised that those reasons would be difficult to justify in an appeal as would the reason cited at this meeting about exiting the application site as there is no policy provision requiring that vehicles should exit a site in forward gear. Councillor John I. Jones confirmed that his primary reason for proposing refusal was non-compliance with policy PCYFF 2.

In the ensuing vote the proposal to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation was carried by 5 votes to 4.

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

### **7.2 FPL/2022/215 – Full application for the erection of an agricultural shed for the storage of machinery together with retention of resurfacing works at Capel Bach, Rhosybol**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee having been called in by a Local Member. At its meeting held on 7 December, 2022, the Committee resolved to visit the site. An in person site visit was subsequently held on 20 December, 2022.

*Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application the Chair, Councillor Neville Evans withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and determination thereof. The item was chaired by the Vice-Chair, Councillor Glyn Haynes.*

The Development Management Manager reported that the application site is located in the open countryside outside any defined development boundary or identified cluster and lies approximately 217m from the dwelling of Capel Bach. No justification has been provided for this location which encroaches significantly into the open countryside and away from the

existing built form. At 23m long, 16m wide and 6.8m high, the proposed shed is considered large in scale with such structures being usually linked to substantially sized farmyards and/or agricultural sites. It is considered that due to its size, coupled with its prominent open countryside location the proposal does not comply with policies PCYFF 3 and 4 of the JLDP. The Development Management Manager referred to TAN 6 which states that such developments should be assimilated into the landscape and form part of a group rather than stand in isolation and they should relate to existing buildings in size and colour. It is considered that the development does not enhance the character of the proposed site and would have a detrimental visual impact on the undeveloped open field's countryside topography.

In terms of the justification for the shed, a statement has been provided for the application listing the machinery to be stored within the proposed shed as detailed within the report. Having measured the plans, the amount of land owned by the applicant is approximately 7.5 acres and not 10 acres as stated in the submission which is considered a small amount of land for the significantly sized shed and the claimed agricultural use of the site. A visit to the site shows the use to be more of a tourism/business nature than agriculture with no indication of the presence of livestock or crop growing. An adjacent field is part of a Caravan Tourer Club which can site 5 tourer caravans at any one time and other leisure type facilities are sited within the location plan as noted in the report leading to the conclusion that the land owned is more for leisure/business rather than agricultural use. Given the lack of justification for an agricultural shed of the scale proposed in an open countryside location it is considered that the proposal does not comply with the relevant planning policies and it is recommended that the application be therefore refused.

Councillor Aled Morris Jones, a Local Member asked that a video of the site visit be shown to the Committee given that only two of its members attended the in-person visit which was held during a busy period before Christmas and because it would help the Local Members highlight key points. The Development Management Manager advised that the video had been available to be viewed on the Teams platform on the day it was created and that replaying the video to the meeting is defeating the object of a site visit. Councillors Ken Taylor and Geraint Bebb thought that the video showing was unnecessary and the Chair ruled that consideration of the application should proceed without the video being showed to the meeting.

Councillor Aled Morris Jones spoke in support of the application saying that the family had developed the site to a high standard and that the shed was required for the safe keeping of machinery in connection with the site. He referred to there being a number of agricultural sheds in the area including some close to the application site, specifically a large shed near the access to the site which is linked to a 4 acre holding as well as another shed which is used as a place of worship. The location of the proposed shed is out of site in a dip in the landscape.

Councillor Derek Owen, also a Local Member supported the comments made by Councillor Aled Morris Jones adding that this was a local family who had undertaken a great amount of work at Capel Bach and were in need of a shed to keep valuable machinery to maintain the site.

The Planning Development Manager advised that being a local family is not a relevant planning consideration. The application for the shed referred to near the access to the site which was approved last year was accompanied by a business plan with the applicants renting 4 acres of land and owning 27 acres as agricultural contractors. The shed being used as a place of worship was approved on appeal but was previously an agricultural shed. While the presence of sheds is expected in an agricultural area they are specifically

linked to farms whereas justification for the proposal as an agricultural shed has not been proven.

Councillor Ken Taylor said that the site visit showed that preparatory works had been undertaken on site and although the application is for an agricultural shed there was little sign of agriculture or crops. He proposed, seconded by Councillor Geraint Bebb that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor John I. Jones who was concerned by the proposal's isolated location away from the main dwelling was in agreement.

**It was resolved to refuse the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report for the reasons set out therein.**

### **7.3 FPL/2022/195 – Full application for the creation of a 14.75m high, 5kW wind turbine at Pendref, Llanfairynghornwy**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At its meeting held on 7 December, 2022 the Committee resolved to visit the site. A virtual site visit was subsequently conducted on 21 December, 2022.

#### *Public Speaker*

Mr John E.H. Roberts, the applicant spoke in support of the proposal saying that by following the policy guidelines he and his wife had endeavoured to mitigate the turbine's visual and environmental impact on the special landscape that is the AONB. He described how the turbine's carefully selected location away from immediate neighbours and on a downhill slope would not impinge upon the AONB's special qualities even when viewed at a distance. To assist the landscape's capacity to assimilate the development it would be painted in the same hues as the surrounding telegraph posts. Everything had been done to minimise the proposal's impact and to prevent it breaching the thresholds whereby it would be considered overpowering or oppressive. Mr Roberts referred to the ongoing debate around climate change and said that he and his wife were firm believers in thinking globally but acting locally and that all they were asking was to be allowed to continue to make their own small contribution to Wales and Anglesey's ambitious targets to save, store and produce energy. He outlined the measures they had already taken to live as sustainably as possible and emphasised that they were not asking for grants or handouts but were prepared to invest in the future. Mr Roberts asked the Committee to consider that their proposed single turbine in respect of visual and landscape impact would be an acceptable development and that it falls in line with Welsh Government's policy which says that the preservation or enhancement of conservation areas can be achieved where developments do not cause them significant demonstrable harm.

The Development Management Manager reported that the principle of a development such as that proposed is considered under policy AND 1 (Onshore Wind Energy) of the JLDP which supports the erection of wind turbines within the AONB provided that they are of a domestic scale only in being single turbine applications of up to 15m to blade tip and either roof or pole mounted. The proposal is for a single 14.75m high pole mounted turbine which will serve a residential property and as such Officers are satisfied that it can be classed as domestic scale turbine. The turbine is located approximately 120m from the nearest neighbouring property and is 130m away from a nearby campsite and there are no lights that would backlight the turbine and cause flickering or impact any other sensitive receptors. The application states that the annual average wind speed for the site is 27kph which would generate 45dB of noise at a distance of 40m which according to the Welsh Government Practice Guidance is unobtrusive in nature having been likened to the noise of wind in trees. Given that the nearest property is 120m away, a condition to limit noise

emissions is not considered necessary. The location of the site within the AONB means that the scheme must comply with policy AMG 1 of the JLDP which requires that proposals have regard to the AONB Management Plan in terms of design and impact on the special qualities of the AONB. For the reasons set out in the Officer's report, it is not considered that the scheme would have any significant effects on the wider landscape or damage the AONB's special qualities to an extent that would contravene policies ADN 1 or AMG 1. Four letters of representation have been received raising the issues noted which are addressed within the body of the report. Officers are satisfied that the proposal complies with all relevant policies and will not give rise to any unacceptable visual impacts on the wider landscape; the recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Jackie Lewis a Local Member said that she would be speaking on behalf of an objector to the proposal and would not be voting on the matter. She provided background information about the objector who owned a construction company and had diversified into holiday accommodation having established the nearby campsite in 2018 which because of its setting has been recognised for promoting tranquillity and wellbeing. She referred to the Landscape Officer's comments about the scheme having localised visual impacts and queried whether these had been paid sufficient attention in light of policy ADN1 from which she quoted. She referred to the Destination Management Plan which at point 3.2.8 identifies as a threat inappropriate developments in the landscape or too close to tourism facilities such as wind turbines or pylons. She also queried whether the conclusion that the turbine would not cause any flickering had been tested by an actual assessment of another similar turbine and whether an assessment of its impact on the area's geology had been made, its impact on farming and the impact of its installation on narrow rural roads. Likewise with regard to noise impact. A farm and the new development are situated close to the proposed turbine and the turbine will be visible from the campsite. She referred to policy ADN 1 in the context of outlook which states that it may be in the public interest to safeguard the outlook from a private property in respect of unacceptable overbearing or dominating developments and that outlook can be affected by the close siting of another structure; the guidance also applies as regards the impact on properties occupied as tourist accommodation. Councillor Jackie Lewis referred to the campsite and to a holiday cottage accommodation that was being developed which would be thus affected. She cited the factors that determine whether visual impact is adversely affected by a turbine including the proximity of the turbine to residential property or tourist accommodation and she highlighted the considerations in relation to the impact on tourism and recreation as important elements of the local economy stating that wind turbine development should not have a negative effect on the local economy. Also PCYFF 4 states that how the development protects and respects local and strategic views should be demonstrated.

The Development Management Manager in responding to the points made said that the virtual site visit provided a comprehensive view of the development from various perspectives within its wider setting. The proposal is at a sufficient distance from the campsite and holiday cottage to overcome any concerns regarding noise and/or flicker effects and while it is close to the public footpath it is not considered the effect will be significant. The application is for a single domestic use wind turbine which is not on a scale that will adversely impact the wider area. The Council is keen to promote the concept of an Energy Island and the proposal as part of an effort to live sustainably accords with this principle.

Councillor Robin Williams said that although he respected the Local Member's views and the concerns of the objector and had himself in the past spoken against large scale wind turbines, having viewed a recording of the virtual site visit he did not think the proposal would have any effect on other residential properties; given the importance of everyone contributing towards combating climate change he proposed that the application be approved and was seconded by Councillor Geraint Bebb.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report subject to the planning conditions set out therein.**  
*(Councillor Jackie Lewis abstained from voting as did Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE as he had not attended the virtual site visit)*

**7.4 DIS/2022/63 – Application to discharge conditions (05) landscaping, (08) (signage), (16) (mitigation risk assessment) of planning permission FPL/2021/337 (Full application for the construction of an Inland Border Facility (IBF) at Former Roadking Truckstop, Parc Cybi, Holyhead**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is to discharge conditions imposed by the Committee in determining planning application reference FPL/2021/337 - Full application for the construction of an Inland Border Facility (IBF) at Former Roadking Truckstop, Parc Cybi, and Holyhead – at its meeting held on 2 March, 2022.

The Development Management Manager reported that determination of the application had been deferred at the Committee's 7 December, 2022 meeting as Welsh Government's Transport Division had requested further information; the requested information has since been received and forwarded to Welsh Government's Transport Division. Following a meeting between the applicant and Welsh Government held on 9 January, Welsh Government has asked for further information in relation to condition (16) (mitigation risk assessment) with regard to mitigation measures should the Inland Border Facility be closed for any reasons. Consequently and because further work is required the applicant has withdrawn condition (16) from the application which will be re-submitted once information is provided to the satisfaction of Welsh Government. The application therefore applies to conditions (05) and (08) only. The Development Management Manager advised that the landscaping scheme presented has been confirmed as acceptable by the Council's Senior Landscaping and Tree Officer; likewise the Policy and Welsh Language Manager is satisfied with the signage scheme. It is therefore recommended that conditions (05) (landscape) and (08) (signage scheme) be discharged.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor Ken Taylor, that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation with respect to discharging condition (05) (landscaping) and condition (08) (signage).**

**7.5 FPL/2022/172 – Full application for conversion, alterations and extension of an existing outbuilding into a rural enterprise workers dwelling together with the installation of a sewage treatment plant at Eirianallt Goch Farm, Carmel, Llanerchymedd**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At its meeting held on 7 December, 2022 the Committee resolved to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the grounds that the fact that the original agricultural dwelling on the holding (Eirianallt Goch) was sold as a result of divorce is not a reason to refuse the application and that it is important to safeguard farms and support the rural economy and farming in Wales for future generations.

The Development Management Manager in addressing the reasons for approving the application at the last meeting referred to the history of permissions for agricultural dwellings on the site as detailed in the Officer's report to the previous meeting and said that

the key issues are not the fact of divorce but that two rural enterprise dwellings have already been permitted on the site with one (Eirianallt Goch) not having been used for that purpose since the other was built and having since been sold meaning there is no justification for a third rural enterprise dwelling on the site less than three years since the disposal of Eirianallt Goch. The assessment of the business plan also confirms this conclusion. The Local Planning Authority does not disagree that supporting the rural economy is important and accepts that succession will take place on this farm. However, specific processes need to be followed to ensure that succession takes place through secure and legally binding arrangements. National policy notes that management of a farm business must be transferred to a person younger than the current person responsible for the farm business or the younger person needs to be responsible for the majority of the farm business and be the decision maker for the business. This is not the case in relation to the proposal, with the planning statement submitted by the applicant noting that he will be succeeding his father at a time as yet unknown. The LPA therefore considers the application to be premature and that it should be refused until it can be demonstrated that such secure and legally binding arrangements are in place in accordance with policy and that the business plan is able to show that there is a real need for another rural enterprise dwelling on the farm.

The Local Planning Authority considers that until the management of the farm business is fully transferred to the applicant there is no need for him to live on site and be present 24 hours a day as Mr Williams (senior) is present as the owner and farmer responsible for the enterprise. There is no reason to prevent Mr Huw Williams from living locally and no evidence has been presented to show why this is not an option. Therefore in the absence of the secure and legally binding arrangements required by TAN 6 and because of the financial information presented as part of the application, the recommendation remains to refuse the application.

Councillor Llinos Medi speaking as a Local member said that while it was the Planning Authority that removed the agricultural condition from Eirianallt Goch it was recognised back in 2007 that a second dwelling was needed on site for agricultural reasons; the fact that Mr Huw Williams has not worked on a full time basis on the farm does not mean that he was not working on the farm. The agricultural industry in Anglesey has been traditionally a smaller scale family industry making it difficult to generate enough income to sustain two homes but that does not mean that the labour of two workers is not required to run the farm. The Officer's report to the Committee's 7 December meeting confirmed that the proposal is acceptable in many respects. Evidence to show that Mr Huw Williams has 51% of the farm's financial benefit and responsibility has been submitted. The agricultural situation in Anglesey needs to be considered differently to the expectations set out in TAN 6 and planning policy should not prevent the industry from being safeguarded for the future. The applicant has submitted evidence to demonstrate that the dwelling is required, that he will be succeeding his father at the farm and that the need for two rural enterprise dwellings was recognised in 2007. If Eirianallt Goch had not been sold the family would have had to dispose of the land to fund the divorce thereby leading to a deterioration of the rural economy.

The Development Management Manager advised in response that TAN 6 notes that planning history is an important consideration in applications such as this. The second rural enterprise dwelling approved in 2007 has been occupied by Mr and Mrs Williams for over 10 years and the rural occupancy condition was removed by the Local Planning Authority because the applicant had not lived in the property as an agricultural dwelling for that period. An application was submitted noting that the dwelling was not required as an agricultural dwelling and that being so it could be separated from the farm enterprise and sold for an open market price. Less than three years later an application for a third agricultural dwelling is submitted (two dwellings having already received consent). Although

the principle of succession is accepted, no evidence has been presented to show it will be delivered in line with secure and legally binding arrangements. The business plan does not support the need for a third agricultural dwelling, and the application is considered premature.

Councillor John I. Jones said that he thought that the seven principles contained in the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 were also relevant in this instance and he proposed that the Committee reaffirm its approval of the application. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Geraint Bebb.

**It was resolved to reaffirm the Committee's previous decision to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation for the reasons given and to authorise the Officers to impose planning conditions on the consent as appropriate.**

## **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**

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

## **12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS**

### **12.1 ADV/2022/12 – Application for the erection of a wall mounted heritage interpretation sign to the wall of existing toilet/shower building at Public Conveniences, Porth Dafarch, Isallt Road, Trearddur Bay**

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

The Development Management Manager reported that the application along with following applications 12.2 to 12.5 on the agenda form part of a wider scheme across Holyhead being delivered by the Ynys Cybi Landscape Partnership. He referred to the siting, scale design and appearance of the proposed dual language sign under consideration which he confirmed as acceptable and compliant with planning policies PCYFF 2 and PCYFF 3 of the JLDP. Similarly it is not considered that the proposal in terms of scale and visual appearance will have any negative impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty within which it is situated nor on the character of the building on which it will be erected. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

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

### **12.2 ADV/2022/13 – Application for the siting of a freestanding heritage interpretation graphic panel at Public Car Park, Lôn St.Ffraid, Trearddur Bay**

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

The Development Management Manager reported that the proposal is a small scale development to provide a bilingual heritage interpretation panel in the car park in Trearddur Bay. It is considered to be of appropriate designs and scale which will ensure its integration within the site with no resulting impact on neighbouring properties. It will be informative, accessible to all and complies with the relevant planning policies of the JLDP. The recommendation is to approve the application.

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

### **12.3 ADV/2022/14 – Application for the erection of a heritage interpretation sign at car park near South Stack, South Stack Road, Holyhead**

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

The Development Management Manager reported that the application is to erect a freestanding heritage sign which will be located on the west side of the viewing area. The sign which will be bilingual will include information and images regarding the history of Holy Island. It is not considered that the proposal will impact the use or character of the existing viewing platform nor the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty in which it is located. The overall siting, scale, design and appearance of the proposed scheme comply with the relevant planning policies and it is therefore recommended that the application be approved.

**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 ADV/2022/15 – Advertisement Consent for the erection of a wall mounted heritage interpretation sign to exterior of existing Breakwater Country Park Visitor Centre building**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it was made by the Isle of Anglesey County Council.

The Development Management Manager reported that the proposal is a small scale development to provide a bilingual heritage interpretation sign to the exterior of the existing Breakwater Country Park Visitor Centre. It is of an appropriate design and scale to ensure its integration within the site with no impact on neighbouring properties. It will be informative, accessible to all and is considered to comply with the relevant policies of the JLDP. It is recommended that the application be approved.

**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 ADV/2022/16 – Advertisement Consent for the erection of a freestanding interpretation sign in car park at Penrhos Coastal Park, Holyhead**

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

The Development Management Manager reported that the proposal complies with the relevant planning policies as regards overall siting, scale design and appearance and as such will not impact the use or character of the existing car park nor the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty within which it is located. The recommendation is therefore one of approval.

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

### **12.6 LBC/2022/33 – Listed Building Consent for alterations and repairs at Skinners Monument Pillbox, Holyhead**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the application has been submitted alongside an associated listed building consent application (LBC/2022/34 – Pillbox adjacent to Trearddur Bay Hotel, Trearddur Bay) by the Isle of Anglesey County Council.

The Development Management Manager referred to the proposed works to the Pillbox structure most of which are considered to be repair and maintenance works that do not require formal consent although there are other elements to the work as described in the report. The urgency for coastal defences during the Second World War as well as shortage of some building materials at the time resulted in a vernacular and hurried construction which meant that the pillboxes were never intended to be permanent structures. Consequently construction issues have arisen exacerbated by a longstanding lack of maintenance that need to be addressed to safeguard the structure's long term future. It considered that the proposals submitted have been carefully considered, are justified and sympathetic to the building's character and would not result in harm to the listed character or setting of the listed building or adjacent listed building. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

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

### **12.7 FPL/2022/248 – Full application for the demolition of an existing shed and the erection of a new holiday unit together with the construction of a new access and driveway and associated development at Gwenallt, Llansadwrn**

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

#### *Public Speaker*

Mr Sion Roberts, Cadnant Planning spoke in support of the application saying that the proposal presented had been amended to address the reasons for refusing a previous application for 2 new holiday units. The business plan is now considered acceptable as are the new access arrangements. The application is being recommended for refusal because it is within a residential area and is considered harmful to the character of the area and because it is considered that it would impact the amenity and privacy of the neighbouring property by virtue of overlooking. Mr Roberts said that while Officers have not specified in what way the proposal would harm the character of the area, it should be noted that the application is now for one not two holiday units and an extensive landscaping scheme has been presented to minimise the unit's visual impact; with time the unit will be effectively screened and unlikely to be visible in the area. The unit has been designed for couples or small families thereby limiting any comings and goings; a private garden with decking will be provided and given the number likely to be using the unit at any one time, it is unlikely

that the development would lead to as harmful effects on amenity as residential use. The issue of overlooking was not raised by Officers therefore the applicant has not had an opportunity to respond or to prepare an appropriate scheme to address this objection. As well as the landscaping scheme on the site's western boundary, it is considered that concerns regarding overlooking can be overcome by erecting a fence on the western boundary or by erecting screens to prevent overlooking to the west. The Officer's report confirms that the development will not lead to the over-provision of holiday accommodation in the locality. The applicant is hopeful that the objections can be resolved and would be happy to submit another scheme or to have conditions placed to manage the issue. It is considered that the development complies with policy TWR 2 and policy PCYFF 2.

The Development Management Manager reported that an earlier application for two new holiday units was refused in January, 2022 for the reasons stated in the report and that the views of the Local Planning Authority have not changed as regards the current application. The proposal is located in a residential area and it is not considered that the development would be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area being an incongruous development in the locality which would neither complement nor enhance the character and appearance of the area contrary to policy PCYFF 2. In addition, Llansadwrn is identified as a Cluster which are characterised by an extremely sensitive social character and environment as well as a limited level of services and facilities; it is considered that the development by virtue of its use and associated activity has the potential to be harmful to the sensitive social and residential character of the area contrary to policy. The proposed unit would be encompassed by an elevated deck approximately 1.5m above ground which it is considered would adversely impact the amenities of the neighbouring property through overlooking and loss of privacy. For these reasons and because the proposal is considered contrary to a number of policies the recommendation is to refuse the application.

Councillor Robin Williams agreed that that being located in the centre of the village the proposed development would have a harmful effect on the characteristics of the cluster and he thought the development to be insensitive in that respect. He therefore proposed that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Ken Taylor.

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

**12.8 DIS/2022/36 – Application to discharge conditions (02) (Construction Management Plan), (03) (Construction Environmental Management Plan), (07) (Details/Samples of Materials), (09) (Local Employment Scheme), (10) (Local Supply Chain Scheme) of planning permission FPL/2021/337 – Full application for the construction of an Inland Border Facility (IBF) at Former Roadking Truckstop, Parc Cybi**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is to discharge conditions imposed by the Committee in determining planning application reference FPL/2021/337 - Full application for the construction of an Inland Border Facility (IBF) at Former Roadking Truckstop, Parc Cybi, and Holyhead – at its meeting held on 2 March, 2022.

The Development Management Manager confirmed that information in relation to each of conditions (02) (Construction Management Plan), (03) (Construction Environmental Management Plan), (07) (Details/Samples of Materials), (09) (Local Employment Scheme), (10) (Local Supply Chain Scheme) has been received to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and other statutory consultees so as to enable the conditions to be discharged. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report with respect to fully discharging the conditions requested.**

**12.9 FPL/2022/258 – Full application for alterations and extensions to the existing garage together with its conversion into a two bedroom bungalow at 3 Tan y Graig, Llanfairpwll**

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

The Planning Development Manager reported on the main planning considerations as set out in the Officer's report with regard to proposal's siting and design which were considered acceptable as being in line with policy. With regard to housing considerations, while approval of the site can be supported by the expected provision within the Local Service Centres category the settlement has seen its expected level of growth on windfall sites through units completed in the period 2011 to 2022 meaning that the application has to be justified in terms of outlining how the proposal is addressing the needs of the community. Additional information had been submitted to this end by the applicant which specifies the need for the applicant to relocate to a single storey property in the future with there being only one property for sale in the area which fits the criteria and no recently approved developments apparent in Llanfairpwll. The proposed bungalow would benefit existing and future occupiers being in a central location in the village in close proximity to local amenities and services. The information provided is considered acceptable by the Joint Planning Policy Unit. In terms of its impact on adjacent residential properties, the proposed extension is considered small scale and as such will have little or no greater impact upon the privacy and amenities of neighbours. Despite some objections regarding the proposed access, the Highways Authority has raised no objections to the proposal during consultation. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE proposed, seconded by Councillor Jackie Lewis that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

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

**12.10 FPL/2022/275 – Full application for a new childcare unit at Ysgol Llanfawr, Ffordd Tudur, Holyhead**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the application is made by the Council and is on Council owned land.

*Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application, Councillor Glyn Haynes withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and determination thereof.*

The Development Management Manager reported that the application has been assessed against the criteria set out in ISA Policy 2 Community Facilities. The application site lies within the Holyhead development boundary in line with criterion i of ISA Policy 2 and the applicant has confirmed that there are no alternative buildings that can be used for the purpose of the proposal thereby satisfying the requirement of criterion ii which refers to new buildings and whether the needs of the community can be met by the use or conversion of existing buildings. The proposal is considered appropriate relative to the size, character and function of the settlement with Holyhead having been identified as an Urban Service Centre thus meeting criterion iv and is in a sustainable location in accordance with criterion v. The applicant has submitted a Communal and Linguistic Statement in support of the

application which has been confirmed as acceptable by the Policy and Welsh Language Manager. The building will be located within the existing school grounds and vehicular access will be via the existing access to the existing car park with a new pedestrian access off Ffordd Tudur. As such it is not considered that the development will have a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties and the recommendation is one of approval.

In response to a query whether the use of the unit will be temporary until a more permanent structure is put in place, the Development Management Manager confirmed that he understood that the unit will be used permanently as a nursery and that there is no intention to apply for a more permanent building.

Councillor Ken Taylor proposed, seconded by Councillor Jackie Lewis that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

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

### **13 OTHER MATTERS**

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

**Councillor Neville Evans  
Chair**