

# Planning and Orders Committee

## Minutes of the hybrid meeting held on 1 November 2023

- PRESENT:** Councillor Ken Taylor (Chair)  
Councillor Glyn Haynes (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors Geraint Bebb, Jeff Evans, Neville Evans, Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE, Dafydd Roberts, Robin Williams, Liz Wood.
- Local Members: Councillors Non Dafydd and Douglas Fowlie (for application 12.9), Gwilym O. Jones (for application 12.6), Arfon Wyn (for application 12.3)
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Development Management Manager (RLJ)  
Group Engineer (Development Control and Traffic Management (AR)  
Planning Portal and Systems Support Officer (MO)  
Legal Services Manager (RJ)  
Committee Officer (ATH)  
Webcasting Officer (FT)
- APOLOGIES:** Councillors John I. Jones, R. Llewelyn Jones, Jackie Lewis Alwen Watkin
- ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor Nicola Roberts (Portfolio Member for Planning, Public Protection and Climate Change), Councillors Margaret M. Roberts, Derek Owen, Llio Angharad Owen, Sion O. Hughes (Senior Planning Officer), Owain Rowlands (Planning Officer).
- 

### 1 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors John I. Jones, R. Llewelyn Jones, Jackie Lewis, and Alwen Watkin.

### 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

No declaration of interest was received.

### 3 MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 4 October, 2023 were presented and were confirmed as correct.

### 4 SITE VISITS

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

### 5 PUBLIC SPEAKING

There were Public Speakers in respect of applications 12.6 and 12.9.

**6 APPLICATIONS THAT WILL BE DEFERRED**

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

**7 APPLICATIONS ARISING**

**7.1 FPL/2022/186 – Change of use of agricultural land into touring caravan park, change of use of existing building to use ancillary to the caravan park together with the installation of a package treatment plant at Esgobaeth Bran, Llanbedrgoch.**

The application was withdrawn.

**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 DIS/2023/17 – Application to discharge condition (16) (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 presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the application is to discharge a condition imposed by the Planning and Orders Committee in determining planning application reference FPL/2021/337- Full Application for the construction of an Inland Border Facility (IBF) at the former Roadking Truckstop, Parc Cybi, Holyhead.

The Development Management Manager reported that condition (16) required the applicant to submit a risk assessment including mitigation measures should the site be unable to undertake the required checks or operate the site due to any unexpected site closure. The details submitted have been forwarded to the Highways Department and to the Welsh Government's Department for Economy and Infrastructure and no objections have been raised. It is therefore considered that the information received is sufficient to discharge condition (16) (risk assessment/mitigation measures).

Councillor Robin Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor Geraint Bebb 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 and that condition (16) is thereby discharged.**

**12.2 VAR/2022/71 – Application under Section 73 for the variation of condition (15) (condition survey for the extent of the slip roads) of planning permission reference FPL/2021/337 (Full application for the construction of an Inland Border Facility - IBF) so as to allow the details to be submitted and approved following the commencement of development works at Former Roadking Truckstop, Parc Cybi, Holyhead**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is made under Section 73 to vary application reference FPL/2021/337 – Full application for the construction of an Inland Border Facility (IBF) at the former Roadking Truckstop, Parc Cybi, Holyhead which was determined by the Planning and Orders Committee at its meeting held on 2 March, 2022.

The Development Management Manager reported that condition (15) required the developer within 6 months of the date of the permission to have submitted to the Local Planning Authority a condition survey for the slip roads at Junction 2 of the A55 to ensure that the proposed development did not have an adverse impact upon the wider highway network. The condition was originally requested by Welsh Government Highways and although the information in the surveys provided by the developer was initially not to the satisfaction of Welsh Government Highways, following further discussions the holding direction issued by Welsh Government Highways was lifted and they raised no objections to the in-effect discharge of condition (15). The Local Planning Authority is therefore satisfied that the condition can be varied accordingly and the recommendation is to approve the application.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor Dafydd Roberts 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 planning conditions set out therein.**

**12.3 FPL/2023/61 – Full application for the change of use of agricultural land into holiday lodge site, siting 13 holiday lodges, construction of new road on site, alterations to existing vehicular access together with soft and hard landscaping on land at Taldrwst, Lon Fain, Dwyran**

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

The Chair announced that he and the Development Management Manager had received a request from Councillor John I. Jones as a Local Member that the application site be visited by the Committee due to local concerns regarding the proposal particularly in relation to flooding issues.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor Geraint Bebb that the application site be visited in accordance with the Local Member's request.

**It was resolved that a site visit be conducted in accordance with the Local Member's request for the reason given.**

**12.4 FPL/2023/42 – Full application for the demolition of the existing dwelling together with the erection of two new dwellings at Treiddon, Beach Road, Menai Bridge**

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

Councillor Robin Williams speaking as a Local Member asked that the Committee visit the application site and that additionally members of the Committee be also allowed to view the site from the mainland opposite in order to gain a better appreciation of the potential visual impact of the proposal on the landscape and locality as well as on the wider viewscape.

Councillor Geraint Bebb proposed, seconded by Councillor Neville Evans that the application site be visited in accordance with the Local Member's request.

**It was resolved that a site visit be conducted in accordance with the Local Member's request for the reason given.**

**12.5 FPL/2023/235 – Full application for the construction of a plant room to house two water source heat pumps, installation of two air source heat pumps, erection of steel fencing, erection of steel barrier together with associated works at Isle of Anglesey County Council, Llangefni**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the application site is Council owned land.

The Development Management Manager reported that planning permission had previously been granted in October 2022 for a similar development on land to the rear of the Council Offices under application reference FPL/2022/198. Due to subsequent concerns regarding the previously proposed area and flooding, this application seeks to provide an alternative location elevated within the existing car parking area which will negate the potential or impact of a flooding risk. The proposal in being located on part of the existing Council car park would result in the reduction of 6 parking spaces. However, a Workplace Travel Plan submitted as part of the application has assessed the impact of the development on the capacity and demand of the car park and confirms that the current provision is 482 spaces with approximately 45% of staff on site at any one time meaning that only 60% of the car parking allocation is taken up at any one time. The loss of 6 spaces would not therefore have a detrimental impact upon the demand for parking spaces. Given the location of the proposed development on Council land with no neighbours or other uses nearby, it is not considered that the proposal will have any effects on the appearance, character or amenities of the surrounding area and it is therefore considered acceptable. The recommendation is to approve the application.

Councillor Geraint Bebb proposed, seconded by Councillor Jeff Evans 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 planning conditions set out therein.**

**12.6 VAR/2023/59 – Application under Section 73A for the variation of condition (04) (Seasonal Use) of planning permission reference FPL/2021/30 (Change of use of existing Cartio Môn site into touring caravan site with 20 touring caravan pitches together with construction of a private road) so as to allow all year-round use of site as touring caravan site at Bryn Goleu Caravan Site, Bryngwran**

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

***Public Speaker***

Mr Martin Williams, the applicant spoke in favour of the application to vary condition (04) to allow the Bryn Goleu caravan site to open throughout the year. He pointed out that condition (04) was relaxed during the Covid pandemic to enable businesses to take advantage of the “staycation boom” within the UK during that period and the facility was used when allowed to open during that time by Mark Drakeford in Cardiff. Following the pandemic many people have invested in caravans, motorhomes and camper vans and want to use them legally during the winter months. The A4 and A55 laybys near Bryn Goleu are used by wild campers who park overnight and leave their rubbish on the road and over the hedge which is unacceptable. Part of this situation can be addressed without cost to the Council by using the resources available at Bryn Goleu. The wild campers might take some persuading but the availability of a provision would weaken their argument. Policy TWR 5 refers to high quality provision which is what is available at Bryn Goleu. The cost-of-living crisis means that local businesses such as public houses need custom throughout the year to create permanent rather than seasonal jobs. Mr Williams said that he had intended to submit the application last year but personal health issues meant that he was unable to do so. As a local third generation family in Bryn Goleu they were there for the “long haul” by investing in, and developing the enterprise following the very dark days of the pandemic and he was asking for the Committee’s support. Application FPL/2021/349 was granted permission throughout the year so what is the difference. Point 3 of JDLP PS-14 refers to year-round use but TWR 5 does not.

The Development Management Manager referred to Policy TWR 5 as the relevant policy in this instance and said that although the policy does not specifically state that all year-round touring caravans are prohibited it is obvious from the policy’s title and relevant criteria that it has not been designed to support permanent all year-round developments. There is an expectation in criteria 3 and 7 that units are removed from sites during the closed season or when not in use. The Council Solicitor is of the same view as the Policy Unit that it is clear from the wording of the policy that its intention is to support seasonal development only. As mentioned by the Public Speaker the Committee has previously approved a similar application in Caerau, Llanfairynghornwy but there are significant differences between the two, and whilst the current application relates to touring caravans the proposal in Caerau was in relation to tents the year-round impact of which in a landscape where there are no leaves on trees is totally different to that of prominent white caravans. Due to topography and significant screening the application site in Caerau is not visible which was an important material consideration in determining the application. It is unlikely that there will be any great demand for camping during the winter but the facility is available if needed and tents will be removed after they have been used whereas permitting year-round caravans means they will be on site year-round and will not be removed in the closed season as required by the criteria in Policy TWR 5. It is therefore considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy TWR 5 and that there are no other material considerations to indicate that the decision should be anything other than to refuse the application. The recommendation is therefore one of refusal.

Councillor Gwilym O. Jones, a Local Member spoke in support of the application and emphasised the local credentials of the family at Bryn Goleu which lends itself as a caravan site being close to the A5 with no highways or visibility issues. He referred to the problems arising with wild campers which since they have been prevented from pitching at Cymyran Beach have taken to parking in the laybys near Bryn Goleu and leaving their rubbish behind. Bryn Goleu is suitable as a site for these campers year-round and as well as solving this problem, its availability year-round would help local businesses and the local economy over the quieter winter months. Councillor Jones said that he was present when Bodedern Community Council debated the application at length and gave it their support. Whilst acknowledging that Officers must have regard to policy in drawing up their reports, he emphasised the importance of the local perspective and of exercising flexibility in

considering an application such as this and he asked the Committee to consider approving the application.

In responding to the Local Member's comments the Development Management Manager reiterated that the proposal is contrary to Policy TWR 5 and that both Officers and the Committee are duty bound to assess applications against current policy which states clearly that touring caravans must be removed from sites during the closed season. Approving the application could open the door to many more such applications. Additionally there is no guarantee that wild campers would use the site – as the name suggest wild campers go wherever they want to and so that is not a robust justification for supporting the proposal. Moreover being a local family is not a material planning consideration. In response to a suggestion by Councillor Dafydd Roberts that a condition be imposed on consent that would restrict any stay to no longer than two weeks with no return within one month, the Development Management Manager advised that it would not be possible to monitor such an arrangement and, in any case, there are other sites open for twelve months and nothing to suggest that wild campers would use the application site over those.

Councillor Neville Evans said that he was torn by the application and that he agreed with many of the Local Member's comments. He knew about the family and the site's history and was aware that the Covid pandemic had affected the former Cartio Mon business meaning the family had had to diversify the business. As Portfolio Member for Tourism he was familiar with the problems with wild camping and he supported sites such as Bryn Goleu as that kind of camping needs to be stopped. As a resident of the village he knew that users of the Bryn Goleu site also buy and spend in the village thereby supporting local businesses. He thought the fact that Policy TWR 5 does not specifically prohibit all year-round touring caravans means that they can be allowed and that the ambiguity of the wording makes it capable of accommodating local factors which is particularly relevant in this case. Bryn Goleu is a neat and accessible site and is screened from view and taking all these things into consideration he supported the application. He therefore proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

The Development Management Manager highlighted that criteria 3 and 7 of Policy TWR 5 are clear in stating that units must be removed from a site out of season or when not in use which is important in terms of visual effects during that period of the year. He advised that the use of the term touring caravans is also important in this context.

Councillor Jeff Evans said that Policy TWR 5 does not explicitly state that touring caravans are excluded all year round and that Mark Drakeford must have agreed with this interpretation as the condition was relaxed during the pandemic. Councillor Evans said that he knew the site as a professional and well-run site and was confident that it would continue as such were it to be operational all year. There are problems with the use of laybys because of costs and the unavailability of alternative options. Councillor Evans said he supported the application because he did not think it contrary to Policy TWR 5 and because there is a need for the provision and also because he would like to see local businesses benefiting from visitors to the Island. He seconded the proposal of approval.

The Development Management Manager advised that the relaxation of the condition during the pandemic was a temporary measure to boost the economy during a difficult period which has since ended and he could not see that that remained a valid argument for approving the application. The fact that Policy TWR 5 does not state that year round touring caravans are excluded does not mean that they can be included and the wording of the relevant criteria is clear in supporting seasonal development.

Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE was also supportive of the application but suggested additional screening to mitigate any visual effects. Although supportive of the proposal,

Councillor Robin Williams was concerned that caravans would remain on site permanently were the site to be open all year and he proposed an amendment that the period of operation be extended from 7 months to 10 months of the year from 1 February to 30 November. The amendment was not seconded.

The Legal Services Manager advised that if the Committee is minded to interpret Policy TWR 5 as not confining touring caravans to seasonal use, then that has wider implications in so far as the proprietors of other such sites with seasonal restrictions could come forward with applications for all year-round use based on their being professional and well run sites. The Committee must be aware of what might result from changing the policy to do justice to one individual in this specific case. In response to a question about setting a precedent the Legal Services Manager advised that that could be the case in that interpreting the policy differently to that set out by the Officer, namely that touring caravans operate on a seasonal basis only the Committee is in effect stating that Policy TWR 5 has no restrictions on use. In that case it will be difficult for the Committee to determine which applications it will support and which it will reject because in this particular instance there are personal reasons which are swaying members towards supporting the application. Whilst there may be no such personal reasons with other applications there may be equally relevant planning reasons in that sites are professional and well run. Interpreting Policy TWR 5 as having no seasonal restrictions on touring caravans is tantamount to changing the policy and is likely to have wider implications.

Councillor Jeff Evans wanted to know what the detrimental factors were of approving the application in this instance and across the board saying that any other applications would be considered as they were presented. He could not see the difference why sites could open some months and not others and thought that there would be benefits to the local economy and businesses from sites being able to open out of season as well as providing people who want to travel out of season with the opportunity to do so. Councillor Dafydd Roberts highlighted that the application site had been open throughout the year during the pandemic without any problems being reported which could be an argument for approving the application other than personal reasons.

The Development Management Manger re-emphasised that the impact on the landscape of large white caravan structures all year round especially in some sites on the Island would be a cause of concern and would be especially pronounced off season when there is reduced screening from trees.

In the subsequent vote on the application, 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 as the Committee deemed the proposal to be in line with Policy TWR 5 as the policy does not specifically prohibit year-round use of touring caravan sites.**

***(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 reason given for approving the application)***

**12.7 VAR/2023/41 – Section 73 application to vary condition (01) of application VAR/2020/24 (Full application for improvements to the existing highway (A5025) between A5 east of Valley Junction to the proposed Power Station Access Road Junction at eight separate locations together with reconstruction and localised widening of existing pavement and surface dressing, temporary construction compound including temporary pavement recycling facility, creation of 2 attenuation ponds and maintenance access, creation/temporary diversion of cycle routes,**

**creation of alternative parking facilities to mitigate loss of layby together with other associated works including drainage, boundary treatments, planting, new signage and road markings) so as to extend the implementation period of the development by a further three years along the A5025 between A5 east of Valley Junction to Power Station Cemaes.**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as it includes land in the ownership of the Isle of Anglesey County Council.

The Development Management Manager reported that planning permission 27C106E/FR/ECON granted consent to carry out online improvements along approximately 16.19km of the A5025 highway between A5 east of Valley Junction to the proposed power station access road junction at eight separate locations. These were part of Horizon's Wylfa Newydd new nuclear project's transport strategy and were a means of mitigating the predicted impacts of the increased traffic flow involved with the construction and operation of the Wylfa Newydd nuclear project in particular the early day construction activities and prior to further mitigating measures becoming available. Condition (01) of planning permission 27C106E/FR/ECON required the development to be implemented before the expiration of three years from the date of consent i.e. before 13 July, 2020. A section 73 variation of condition application (registered under reference VAR/2020/24) was approved by the Committee in August 2020 which extended the implementation period of the development consented under 27C106E/FR/ECON for a further three years until 13 July, 2023. The current section 73 application seeks permission to vary condition (01) of planning application VAR/2020/24 to extend the implementation period by a further three years until 13 July 2026.

Great British Nuclear has been set up by the UK Government to put in place a programme of new nuclear development to deliver up to 20 GW of nuclear power in the UK by 2050. The Wylfa site remains an allocated site for new nuclear development and has been identified as the best and most suitable site for such a development. In assessing the national policy perspective in relation to the application, it is considered that significant weight should be given to National Policy Statements EN-1 and EN-6. The latter identifies Wylfa as one of 8 suitable sites in the UK for nuclear development meaning there is strong policy justification for the proposal. Horizon as the owner of the site has confirmed its commitment to promoting the site for future nuclear development and as part of Horizon's commitment to leaving a positive legacy to the site it is considered that preserving the planning permission for the A5025 online highway improvements is an integral part of facilitating any future development as well as addressing the limitations of the existing road leading to the site.

The Development Management Manager explained that the original permission included a series of conditions and he confirmed that should the application be approved, these will remain attached to the consent. The conditions included a requirement to undertake a number of surveys and studies to ensure an up to date understanding of the position and also to agree a method for undertaking the work that minimises the effects on the local community, residents and the environment. Any consent would also be conditioned to ensure that the developer engages with the Council and the relevant communities at the earliest opportunity before the commencement of works to ensure that local benefits are secured including the best use of local labour, skills and supply chains.

Given that there has been no change in national or local policy since the last application to extend the implementation period was approved, nor any change to the proposal or the conditions proposed as part of the application, it is considered that further extending the implementation period is acceptable and it is therefore recommended that the application be approved.



Councillor Robin Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor Neville Evans 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 planning conditions set out therein.**

**12.8 VAR/2023/40 – Application under Section 73 for the deletion of condition (04) (Ground Levels), (07) (Landscaping), (14) (Highways) and for the variation of condition (02) (Approved Plans) of planning permission reference FPL/2020/247 (Erection of 9 dwellings) so as to amend the plans to erect 9 affordable dwellings at Bryn Estate, Llanfaethlu**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is to vary a condition imposed by the Committee in determining planning application reference FPL/2020/247 – Full application for the erection of 9 dwellings together with associated works on land adjacent to Y Bryn Estate, Llanfaethlu.

The Development Management Manager reported that the proposal entails the removal of conditions (04) (Ground Levels), (07) (Landscaping), and (14) (Highways) and for the variation of condition (02) (Approved Plans) of planning permission reference FPL/2020/247 (Erection of 9 dwellings) so as to amend the plans to erect 9 affordable dwellings in lieu of 7 open market and 2 affordable units previously approved on the site. Further details of the existing and finished floor levels, landscaping and detailed highway drawings have been submitted in support of the application. Having consulted with the relevant specialists it is considered that the information presented is acceptable and sufficient to discharge conditions (04), (07), and (14).

The previous scheme entailed the erection of 7 detached open market housing and two semi-detached affordable units. The current scheme is for the erection of three pairs of semi-detached units along with a terrace of 3 units. Plots 1 to 5 will be 2-bedroom properties and plots 6 to 9 will be 3-bedroom properties. The scale of the dwellings and mix of bedroom numbers are considered acceptable by the Housing Service and comply with the requirements of Policy TAI 8 (Appropriate Housing Mix of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan). Although it is the developer's intention to make the development 100% affordable, this cannot be legally secured as the development is within the development boundary, and so the additional 80% affordability is at the developer's discretion. A Section 106 agreement will state that if the site is developed for a private developer, there will be a need to provide 20% affordable housing with the affordable units to be identified before the commencement of works on site. It is not considered that the amended scheme will have a detrimental impact on the nearby residential properties or locality beyond that of the previously approved scheme and so the recommendation is to approve the application.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE 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 planning conditions set out therein.**

**12.9 FPL/2021/124 – Full application for demolition of existing piggery units, change of use of land into holiday chalet site, siting 25 holiday chalets, alterations to existing vehicular accesses, construction of private roads, construction of parking areas, installation of package treatment, soft and hard landscaping together with associated works on land at Bodwina Bellaf, Gwalchmai**

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

### ***Public Speakers***

Mr Maldwyn Owen, **an objector** to the application spoke on behalf of Mr and Mrs Williams, Ty'n Rhos and the majority of the locality's immediate neighbours who were opposed to the application. He referred to the number of objection letters received by the Planning Service but pointed out the absence of any acknowledgement in the Planning Officer's report of the letter of unanimous opposition sent by Trewalchmai Community Council. He said that the application had been amended several times and that all the documents had to be scrutinised carefully as they contain some errors. In noting that the Highways Department had objected to the application he highlighted the following –

- The applicant's intention was erroneous as he did not own the land needed to create the fifth passing bay.
- The Traffic Survey states that there would be near on 1,000 additional weekly movements on a small country road leading up to the site. Visitors would have to travel from the site due to the lack of any recreational facilities. The report does not accurately reflect the amount of cars already using the road as it was only completed three years ago on the brink of the lockdown period.
- The lack of footpath and lighting on the road meaning the scheme does not support safe and sustainable travel.
- The area is too small to accommodate 25 holiday lodges which would be equal to creating a village in a Welsh rural area with visitors outnumbering local people. There would be approximately 136 people on site compared to in the region of 26 residents in the local area which is how Welsh communities decline.
- The land is enclosed and the application does not fully consider the legal position with regard to surface water drainage.
- There is no Drainage Strategy report and porosity tests undertaken by the applicant himself only go down as far as 12 inches into the ground.
- There is no updated Ecology report for the whole site, the development would create light pollution in a naturally dark area.
- Until he had received a report from a specialist company, the applicant did not have any register or record of the presence of asbestos and asbestos pollution levels on site. The report records high level of asbestos pollution on the land and site.
- The Defence Ministry has stated the need for Construction Traffic Strategy authorised by the Planning Department before the commencement of development. The application does not sufficiently address the Ministry's requirements.

Sioned Edwards, Cadnant Planning spoke as **a supporter** of the application saying that the application is being recommended for refusal based on a highways issue alone with the Highways Department raising concerns about one of the passing bays closest to the A5 even though the location, number and design of the passing bays were agreed with the Highway Officer about 18 months ago. The Highways Department require a width of 5.5m and insist that the available width of 4.7m is insufficient by 0.8m to create a safe passing bay. Whilst 5.5m would be desirable, a width of 5.5m is not necessary to enable two vehicles to pass each other. Roads with two-way traffic are often 5m wide or less and there are many passing bays on roads across the Island that are narrower than 5.5m. What is of real importance is the safety of any passing bay. The road is about 3.5m wide and seems to be able to cope with the traffic flow without any problems. There is no record of any accident on this road over the past 23 years according to Crashmap data. It is obvious that

there are no concerns about safety on this road otherwise the Council would not redirect traffic along the road during the Anglesey Show.

Current traffic flow levels on the road are low and the Traffic flow assessment submitted shows that the development would not lead to any significant increase in traffic. In any case the proposal offers to improve 5 parking spaces along the road. There is no current safety issue on the road that would be made worse by the development. The proposal would not lead to any significant increase in the volume of traffic and is therefore unlikely to lead to any new safety issue. The proposal will improve the current situation in that the road would operate better and more safely than it does at present.

The Officer's report advises that the principle of the development is acceptable and that the proposal would greatly improve the appearance of the site providing high quality holiday units that will attract visitors thereby reducing the pressure on the Island's coastal areas and ensuring that central Anglesey also benefits from economic investment and development and further expenditure in the local economy. The width of one passing bay is the reason for refusal all the others being acceptable. In assessing the application in its entirety it is considered that the improvements to the current situation weigh in favour of supporting the application rather than refusing it because one passing bay is narrower than the others but is still sufficient to be able to operate.

The Development Management Manager reported that the application site is located along a single width country lane which links Gwalchmai to Tynlon. Access to the lane is gained from the A5 with the initial section being dual width which then narrows to a single width making it necessary that the scheme provides passing bays to facilitate traffic flow and highway safety. The scheme offers 5 passing bays some of which are existing informal passing places which will be formalised. Concern was raised by local residents that in order to create the fifth passing place a wall/hedge not in the developer's ownership would have to be removed. Having visited the site and measured the carriageway the Highways Department was not satisfied that a sufficient width could be attained for the fifth passing bay by using highways land only and although a topographic survey provided in support of the application shows that a widening of the carriageway from 3.6m to 4.7m is possible, the Highways Department standards require a width of 5.5m. Due to the insufficient width of the 5<sup>th</sup> passing bay and its location on a corner with poor visibility, the Highways Department is unable to support the proposal and recommend refusal. Consequently, the scheme is considered contrary to policy TRA 4 of the JLDP and the recommendation is to refuse the application.

Councillor Douglas Fowlie, a Local Member for the Crigyll ward in saying that based on the Officer's report and planning policy he could not see any course of action other than to refuse the application, referred to the fact that Trewalchmai Community Council had expressed its concerns regarding the proposal but these were not covered by the Officer's report.

Councillor Non Dafydd, a Local Member for the Canolbarth ward (the application straddling two electoral wards) referred to the recommendation of refusal, which is the outcome wished for by Local Members, the community council and up to 200 signatories of a petition opposing the application. She also referred to the many letters of objection submitted from which she read out extracts and she questioned why therefore the Committee was considering the application. Having been called in by a former county councillor in 2021 due to local concerns, it seemed it could not be withdrawn despite the Officer recommending it be refused as the member who called it in is no longer a serving councillor. It is a complex process which can lead to loss of sleep, stress, and expenditure and in this case, over several years. In normal circumstances the application would have

been refused already but is before the Committee to be determined and she could not see any sufficient reason for supporting it.

The Development Management Manager in response to the comments by the Public Speakers and local members clarified that at the time, as the proposal did not fall within the boundary of Trewalchmai Community Council, the Local Planning Service had consulted with Bodffordd Community Council. Since then the views of Trewalchmai Community Council have been received on 8 September 2021 and although not a statutory consultee, the Council's concerns have been addressed in the Officer's report. The situation regarding the application is unusual and has been explained to the Local Members in an e-mail in that as the former councillor who called in the application is not in a position to withdraw it, it has to be referred to the Committee. Regarding drainage matters, NRW have no concerns on this basis and the proposal would in any case be subject to a SuDS approval process.

Councillor Neville Evans proposed, seconded by Councillor Robin Williams that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

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

### **13 OTHER MATTERS**

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

**Councillor Ken Taylor  
Chair**