

# Planning and Orders Committee

## Minutes of the virtual meeting held on 2 February 2022

- PRESENT:** Councillor Nicola Roberts (Chair)
- Councillors John Griffith, Glyn Haynes, T LI Hughes MBE, K P Hughes, Vaughan Hughes, Eric Wyn Jones (present from application 11.1 onwards), Dafydd Roberts, Ieuan Williams and Robin Williams.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Planning Development Manager (RLLJ), Senior Planning Officer (CR), Business Systems Manager (EW), Development Management Engineer (Highways) (IH), Legal Services Manager (RJ), Committee Officer (MEH).
- APOLOGIES:** Councillor Richard O Jones.
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Members : Councillors Aled M Jones (application 7.3); Margaret M Roberts (application 7.1); J Arwel Roberts (application 7.2).
- Councillors R Meirion Jones, Bryan Owen.

---

In the absence of the Vice-Chair, Councillor Ieuan Williams was appointed Vice-Chair for this meeting only.

### 1 APOLOGIES

As noted above.

### 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor Robin Williams declared a personal interest with regard to application 7.3 on the agenda.

Councillor Robin Williams declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 11.1 on the agenda.

### 3 MINUTES

The minutes of the previous virtual meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 12 January, 2022 were presented and confirmed as correct.

#### **4 SITE VISITS**

The minutes of the virtual site visits held on 26 January, 2022 were confirmed as correct.

#### **5 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

There was a Public Speaker in respect of application 7.3.

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

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

#### **7 APPLICATIONS ARISING**

##### **7.1 FPL/2021/136 – Full application for the conversion of the outbuilding into a holiday letting unit together with alterations and extensions thereto at Wylfa, Bangor Road, Benllech**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the applicant is related to a 'relevant officer' as defined within paragraph 4.6.10 of the Council's Constitution. The application has been scrutinised by the Council's Monitoring Officer as required under paragraph 4.6.10.4 of the Constitution. At its meeting held on 1 December, 2021, the Committee resolved that a virtual site visit be undertaken to the application site. A virtual site visit subsequently took place on 15 December, 2021. At the meeting held on 12 January, 2022 the Committee resolved to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was deemed that the development conforms with planning policies PCYFF 1, PCYFF 2 and PCYFF 3 and it was considered that the development would not lead to an over-concentration of holiday accommodation within the area. The Development Management Manager wished it be recorded that the Welsh version of the report notes that the application was refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation rather than the application was approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Margaret M Roberts, a Local Member said that she was reiterating her comments as at the previous meeting of this Committee that the application is for the conversion of an outbuilding at the rear of the property for a one bedroomed holiday unit. The location of the outbuilding is within the applicant's curtilage and there is adequate parking to accommodate such a development. She asked the Committee to reaffirm its decision to approve the application.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the site is sustainable within the village and the Local Planning Authority have raised no concerns in relation to the sustainability of the site and concur that the site is in a suitable location, this however, is only one consideration against which the development must be considered. No other planning factors against the proposal – such as traffic concerns. Development proposals must be acceptable having regard to all

relevant development plan policies and material planning considerations. A development which is contrary to a specific policy or policy criterion will not necessarily be acceptable simply because it may conform with other relevant policies. The socio-economic and cultural impacts of second homes and short term holiday lets on communities is highly controversial and sensitive at present, which has further intensified since the beginning of the Pandemic; Welsh Government are currently consulting on proposals to introduce new planning legislation and policy to tackle the negative impacts of second home ownership and short-term holiday lets. At the last meeting Members referred that the current provision of 18.47% is only slightly higher than the threshold of 15% contained in the SPG and that this is only a small development of one, one bedroom holiday unit which would constitute only a small increase in overall provision which would not have a significant impact or undermine policy objective. Whilst acknowledging that the current provision of 18.47% in the area is only slightly above the threshold of 15%, it must be considered in context, that it equates to almost 1 in every 5 properties being second homes or short-term holiday lets. Furthermore, approval of the application could set a precedent which would give rise to difficulties in resisting similar application in the locality and other areas where there are high concentrations of second homes and short-term holiday lets. The development is contrary to Criterion v of TWR 2 as the development should not lead to an over-concentration of holiday accommodation within the area. The recommendation was still of refusal of the application.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts said that the over-concentration of holiday unit in the Benllech area is not specifically the result of conversions of outbuildings to holiday lets. He further said that the authority has no powers to prevent existing dwellings being used as 'Air B&B's'. The local problem with second homes and holiday lets is not related to the conversion of small outbuildings into one bedroom holiday lets. The problem will not be addressed by refusing applications of this kind.

Councillor K P Hughes referred to the Welsh Government initiative 'Croeso Cymru' which promote the economy and visitors to Wales. He further said that he considered that it is a duty on the Authority to improve the economy of the Island and he proposed that the application be approved. Councillor Vaughan Hughes seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor John Griffith said that approving the application could set a precedent which would give rise to difficulties in resisting similar application in the locality and other areas and he proposed that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Nicola Roberts seconded the proposal of refusal.

Councillor Ieuan Williams said that the Committee is reminded to consider each application on its own merits. He further referred that he disagreed that approving the application would set a precedent in having to approve similar application in the future. The Chair ascertained legal opinion as to whether approving the application would set a precedent as regards to future similar applications. The Legal Services Manager responded that he did not consider

that approving this application would set a precedent as this proposed holiday unit is within the curtilage of the owner's property and it is for a one bed roomed letting unit.

**It was RESOLVED to reaffirm the Committee's previous approval of the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation.**

## **7.2 FPL/2021/302 – Full application for the change of use of land from agricultural to accommodate 10 touring caravans at Bunwerth, Trearddur Bay**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of two local members. At its meeting held on 12 January, 2022 the Committee recommended that a virtual site visit be undertaken to the application site. A virtual site visit subsequently took place on 26 January, 2022.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application site comprises agricultural land within an AONB area. The application is located in an open countryside location on the outskirts of Trearddur Bay. He referred that an application to accommodate 10 touring caravans on the site was refused in December 2020. Planning policies require that the proposed development needs to be of high quality in terms of design, layout and appearance and is sited in an unobtrusive location, well screened which can be readily assimilated in to the landscape in a way that does not significantly harm the visual quality of the landscape.

The Planning Development Manager referred to Supplementary Planning Guidance – Tourism Facilities and Accommodation – Paragraph 3.1.3 as was noted within the Officer's report which defines the need for high quality development in terms of land use considerations. He further referred that as existing screening on the site which has gaps in the hedgerows and is low in height; the north east of the site would be most visible in views from a short portion of the highway. As the proposal is for tourers, which are predominantly white, the LPA's assessment is that views of the site lean towards it being obtrusive, even if not all the tourers would be completely visible. There is scope for part of each to be visible indicating the breadth of the proposed development. A landscaping scheme has been provided with the planning application; the landscaping scheme would reinforce the existing screening and is predicted in the assessment to take 5 – 10 years to become substantially effective. The application site is also rocky and concerns have been raised as to whether the trees will grow on site as regards to the proposed screening of the site. The Planning Development Manager further said that the landscaping details received with the planning application states that the site is presently well screened, however the Local Planning Authority disagrees and therefore the development is contrary to Criteria 1 of the Policy TWR 5 which states that developments should be sited in an unobtrusive location, well screened which can be readily assimilated into the landscape in a way that does not significantly harm the visual quality of the landscape. It is not considered that the proposal comprises of high quality development and it would also be

harmful to the character and appearance of the area which form part of the AONB. It would be contrary to provisions of policies TWR 5, PCYFF 3 and AMG 1 of the Joint Local Development Plan, Planning Policy Wales and the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The recommendation was to refuse the application.

The Chair read out an email received by Councillor Dafydd R Thomas, a Local Member as he was unable to attend the meeting. Councillor Thomas had referred that the application site is a distance from the highway and would not be harmful to the character and landscape of the area. He had noted that there are other similar caravan sites which have recently been approved on the Island and are in much higher sensitive areas. The applicants are local to the area and are Welsh speakers and have two sons who wish to farm the land and stay within their local community; approving this application would contribute to supporting the family for the future.

Councillor J Arwel Roberts, a Local Member said that only Natural Resources Wales has expressed concerns as regards to this proposed development. There has been no objection by neighbouring properties nor any objections by the Trearddur Community Council. Reference has been made as to the visual impact of the development but the applicant has submitted a landscaping scheme, which over time will screen the site. He further said that part of the land in the ownership of the applicant is SSSI area and the applicant has planted trees to protect the area. Councillor Roberts further referred that he disagreed with the Officer's report that the development would have an effect on the AONB as it is only one agricultural field that the proposed caravan site will be located which is not visible from the highway. He further said that there is a caravan site and storage area opposite the site which is visible; approving the application be support the local family business.

Councillor T LI Hughes MBE said that this proposal will be a seasonal touring caravan site. He further said that the site is not visible from the highway and there is a large caravan site opposite this site. Councillor Hughes proposed that the application be approved. Councillor Glyn Haynes seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor John Griffith said that whilst he was in support of local families who wish to enhance their businesses, as the site is within an AONB he proposed that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. There was no seconder to the proposal of refusal.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was considered that the caravans will not be permanent on the site and further screening of the site will be undertaken by the applicant.**

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

### **7.3 FPL/2021/304 – Retrospective application for the use of a static caravan for holiday purposes at The Lodge, Capel, Bach, Rhosybol**

*(Having declared a personal interest with regard to the application, Councillor Robin Williams withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and determination thereof).*

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At its meeting held on 12 January, 2022 the Committee recommended that a virtual site visit be undertaken to the application site. A virtual site visit subsequently took place on 26 January, 2022.

#### ***Public Speaker***

Mr Mark Davies, the applicant's agent, said it should be noted that the caravan exists on the site and is lawful and can remain onsite irrespective of outcome of this application; it is the use of the caravan that is in question not its physical presence. The Officers report gives one reason for refusal and that relates to whether the proposal is of high quality. The report also quotes Supplementary Planning Guidance on holiday accommodation stating that standalone caravans in people's gardens cannot be considered high quality. It must be noted that this is guidance and not the policy. Notwithstanding this it should be noted that though there is no mention in the report that the applicant has a caravan club licence for 5 caravans on the site. Additionally there is another holiday unit, a conversion, which was granted planning permission in 2019 next to the caravan in question. Furthermore there is a hairdressers salon next to the caravan; the hairdressers salon was granted planning permission in 2018. The contention in the Officers report that this is a standalone holiday unit in a garden is not accurate, it forms part of an existing holiday/commercial use. The relevant Policy in the Development Plan is TWR 3 main points include; (i) *It doesn't lead to a significant intensification in the provision of static caravan or chalet or permanent alternative camping sites in the locality.* This will not lead to such an intensification and no mention of this in the officers report –(ii) *It is of high quality in terms of design, layout and appearance, and is sited in an unobtrusive location where it is well screened by existing landscape.* This is an unobtrusive location and it should be noted that the caravan is lawful and can remain on site. (iii) *That there is adequate access - No objection from highways.*

Mr Davies further said that it is clear that the proposals are compliant with the relevant policies and Supplementary Planning guidance, this is a sustainable form of development and it is respectfully requested that it be supported. This development will provide employment in the locality and will benefit local businesses in the area.

Councillor Aled M Jones, a Local Member ascertained whether the Committee would allow for the recording of the virtual site visit to be viewed at the meeting as it will show the high standards of the current business located on the site and the proposal would be an integrated part of the current business on the site. Members considered that the virtual site visit has been viewed previously and the request was refused.

Councillor Aled M Jones said that the caravan is located on the site and it must be considered that the caravan is part of the business on site. The site is a registered caravan club, has a letting unit and a hairdressing salon on site. The location of the site is sustainable as it is in the village of Rhosybol and will afford employment opportunities. He further said that the proposal is not harmful to the landscape and the access to the site is safe and of high standard. Councillor Jones said that there are planning policies that support such applications and asked the Committee to approve the application.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application is made for the change of use of an existing static caravan used for incidental purposes into holiday accommodation. The application site is located in the open countryside, outside any defined development boundary or identified cluster. The application site is not located within a development boundary and does not therefore accord with planning policy PCYFF 1. It is therefore necessary to consider whether the proposal conforms with relevant plan policies and national planning policy and guidance. Planning Policy TWR 3 of the Joint Local Development Plan relates to Static Caravans and Chalet Sites and notes that the approval of such applications must demonstrate that it does not lead to a significant intensification in the provision of static caravans or chalet or permanent alternative camping sites in the locality and that the proposed development is of high quality in terms of design, layout and appearance, and is sited in an unobtrusive location where it is well screened by existing landscape features and/or where the units can be readily assimilated into the landscape in a way which does not significantly harm the visual quality of the landscape. Furthermore, that the site is located close to the main highway network and that adequate access can be provided without significantly harming landscape characteristics and features. The Planning Development Manager further said that the proposed application relates to the continued use of a single static caravan for holiday purposes. Applications for new permanent caravans must comply with Policy TWR 3 (Static Caravan and Chalet Sites and Permanent Alternative Camping Accommodation) of the Joint Local Development Plan. Policy TWR 3 allows for new permanent caravan development provided that the proposal conforms with the relevant criteria as noted within the Officer's report; this is further explained under guidance in relation to 'high quality' which is stated in the 'Tourism Accommodation and Facilities' SPG under section 5.2.1. Although it is acknowledged that the site has a Caravan Club Licence for 5 touring caravans and a converted single holiday let on site these are considered to be alternative holiday accommodation options as opposed to being associated facilities, therefore the proposal would fail to comply with the guidance provided within the SPG. The recommendation was one of refusal of the application as it was considered to be contrary to the provision of TWR 3 of the Joint Local Development Plan.

Councillor Ieuan Williams said that he considered that the application site is within a sustainable location. He noted that the applicant's agent has noted that the only reasons for refusal is whether the static caravan is of high quality, but it was evident on the virtual site visit that the proposal is contained within a sustainable area and would conform with the current holiday enterprise on the

site. Councillor Williams proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it is part of a current tourism enterprise and is of high quality and it therefore complies with planning policies PCYFF 1 and TWR 3 of the Joint Local Development Plan. Councillor K P Hughes seconded the proposal of approval of the application.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was considered that it is part of a current tourism enterprise and is of high quality and it therefore complies with planning policies PCYFF 1 and TWR 3 of the Joint Local Development Plan.**

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

## **8 ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS**

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

## **9 AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS**

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

## **10 DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS**

### **10.1 FPL/2021/335 – Full application for amendments to the previously approved scheme to include alterations and extensions to Cwm Deri, Dulas**

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

The Planning Development Manager reported that the principle of developing the site has already been established under planning application 44C34A where permission was granted for conversion of outbuildings into four dwelling in 1993. Planning permission has been safeguarded as some of the units on site have been completed. The proposal is to add an extension to the front elevation to an outbuilding and to alter the windows on the side elevation. The existing outbuilding measures 65 square metres, the extension only equates to 19.24 square metres which is, approximately, a 29% increase. Even though the SPG for Conversion of Rural Buildings in the Countryside states that no more than 10% of the outbuilding should be rebuilt, when considering the conversion scheme as a whole for the 4 outbuildings, it is considered that the 29% increase is acceptable. A structural survey has been submitted with the planning application which states that the existing walls of the existing building is suitable of supporting the pitched roof structure. The amendments to the window material is considered acceptable as the material is high quality and conservation-type windows in anthracite that mimics traditional wooden



windows. He further said that the public consultation period does not come to an end until 2 February, 2022 and requested that the Officers be afforded power to act following the public consultation period if no new representations have been received.

Councillor K P Hughes proposed that the application be approved and Councillor Robin Williams seconded the proposal.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application and to grant the Officer's power to act following the statutory public consultation period coming to an end.**

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

### **11.1 MAH/2022/1 – Minor amendments to scheme previously approved under planning permission HHP/2021/315 (Alterations and Extensions) so as to amend design of proposal at 37 Penlon, Menai Bridge**

*(Having declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to the application, Councillor Robin Williams withdrew from the meeting during the discussion and determination thereof).*

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the applicant is a 'relevant officer' as defined within paragraph 4.6.10 of the Constitution. The application has been scrutinised by the Monitoring Officer as required under paragraph 4.6.10.4 of the Constitution.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application is for minor amendments to the previously approved scheme under planning permission HHP/2021/315. The amendments that are proposed are to change the glazing appearance of the two French doors on the South elevation; remove existing kitchen door and block up instead of replacing with full height glazing and making the existing window smaller, now in the lounge, reduce the size of the proposed lantern and change the proposed bio-fold doors to sliding doors. The amendments are considered to be non-material amendments and the scale of the proposed change would not cause an impact different to that caused by the original approval. The proposal would not result in a detrimental impact visually or in terms of local amenity, no third party would be disadvantaged and the proposal would not conflict with national and development plan policies. The application is deemed to be non-material and therefore approved under Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The recommendation is of approval of the application, and to authorise the Head of Service to add to, remove or amend/vary any condition(s) before the issuing of the planning permission.

Councillor John Griffith proposed that the application be approved and Councillor K P Hughes seconded the proposal of approval.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions contained within the written report.**

## **12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS**

### **12.1 FPL/2021/158 – Full application for the erection of a dwelling together with the construction of a vehicular access on land adjacent to Lony Bryn, Trearddur Bay**

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

The Planning Development Manager reported that Trearddur Bay is allocated as a rural/coastal village under policy TAI 5 of the Joint Local Development Plan, which supports the erection of affordable and local market housing subject to the size of the units comply with the defined maximum for the particular type of unit proposed and there are adequate arrangements available to restrict the occupancy of any local market house. The maximum size specified under the policy for a 3 bedroom, 2 story property is 100m<sup>2</sup> floor space; the proposal has a floor area of 100m<sup>2</sup> and its occupancy will be restricted to the use of a S106 legal agreement. It is intended that the dwelling will be occupied by the applicant and information is currently being assessed in relation to the applicant's eligibility for local market housing. There is evidence that the applicant has lived in the local area since 2014, however if the applicant is not eligible to reside at the property, it will be made available to other in local need. This will be secured by the S106 legal agreement.

The Planning Development Manager further referred to the indicative housing supply for Trearddur Bay as was outlined in the Planning Officer's report. He further said that a statement has been provided by a local estate agent in support of the application which ensures there is an existing local need for the property and thus complying with the policy and that the development is not speculative in nature. The proposed dwelling is a two storey property which includes 3 bedrooms and living accommodation on the first floor. One of the key issues raised as part of the publicity was the design of the property and impact on neighbouring property's amenity. The dwelling, which is restricted in its size due to the local market use, has been located to the north west of the plot in order to provide the necessary distances as set out in the local authority supplementary planning guidance design guide between the neighbouring property boundaries and windows. As such, it cannot be considered that the proposal results in impacts upon neighbouring amenity to such an extent that warrants refusal. Several objections also raised concerns that the scheme would be an overdevelopment of the site and would be a cramped/shoehorn form of development. The garden area of the dwelling is 92m<sup>2</sup> as indicated on the proposed site layout plan. Under the SPG – Design Guide, guidance is provided in relation to recommend amenity space for properties with 30m<sup>2</sup> of reasonably shaped space being the recommendation along with additional space for washing lines and sheds etc. At 92m<sup>2</sup>, the

proposal provides ample amenity space above and beyond what is required by the local authority SPG and therefore is not considered that the site is overdeveloped. The recommendation was of approval of the application.

Councillor T LI Hughes MBE, and a Local Member said that he had called-in the application for determination by the Planning and Orders Committee due to concerns that the scheme would be an overdevelopment of the site. He noted that the road at Lon y Bryn is narrow and further development could result in highways issues. He further said that there are local concerns as regards to the development, however, as the Planning Officers are recommending approval of the application Councillor T LI Hughes MBE proposed that the application be approved. Councillor Eric W Jones seconded the proposal of approval.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions contained within the written report.**

#### **12.2 FPL/2021/310 – Full application for the change of use of the existing dwelling into a day centre for children with learning disabilities at Haulfryn, Capel Mawr, Llangrisiolus**

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

The Planning Development Manager reported that the site is located in the rural cluster of Capel Mawr as defined under the Joint Local Development Plan and will provide an essential service to the local community as identified by the Housing Department. The existing dwelling on site is a single storey bungalow which is set within an ample curtilage and includes a private access from the public highway. The proposal is made to change the use of the dwelling in order to provide provision of a day care for children with learning disabilities together with the creation of a new vehicular access. Policy ISA 2 within the Joint Local Development Plan is supportive in maintain and improving community facilities. The proposal is conveniently located adjoining the B4422 which is one of the main routes to the South West of the Island from the A55, with 2 bus stops also located within 400m of the site. The existing building is modestly sized and will not undergo any extension work as part of the proposal. The scale of the use is not considered to be excessive in consideration of the quiet rural character of the area and as such it is considered appropriate as required criterion iv of the policy. Planning Policy PCYFF 2 aims to protect the amenities of residential properties but due to the scale of the operation it is not thought to be to such an extent that would cause a level of disturbance that would be detrimental to residential adjoining dwelling. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with policy PCYFF 2.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts proposed that the application be approved. Councillor John Griffith seconded the proposal of approval.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions contained within the written report.**

**12.3 FPL/2021/289 – Full application for construction of new Multi Use Games Area (MUGA), the erection of fencing together with soft landscaping at Holyhead Secondary School, South Stack Road, Holyhead**

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

The Planning Development Manager reported that the site is located within the grounds of Holyhead High School and was previously a grassed area with the boundaries which flank the residential curtilages of the adjoining dwellings being defined by fencing. The proposal is made for the retention of a multi-use games area which will be for the use of the school. He further said that the proposal does not change the use of the site and as such in land use terms, it is not considered that the scheme represents an intensification of the use of the site as the previously grassed area was utilized as a play area. The area will be for the sole use of the school and will not be open to the public and therefore it is considered that the scheme will not create a greater level of disturbance than is already caused by the use of the school grounds. No lighting is proposed as part of the scheme. The Planning Development Manager further said that it is considered that the scheme is in accordance with planning policy PCYFF 2 of the Joint Local Development Plan which states that proposals should not have an unacceptable impact upon residential amenities. The fence surround the games area will be 3 metres high and of a typical design for games areas which will ensure that the proposal is congruous with the secondary education setting. The recommendation is of approval of the application as it accords with the relevant policies and does not have any unacceptable impact upon residential amenities.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be approved.  
Councillor Ieuan Williams seconded the proposal of approval.

**It was RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions contained within the written report.**

**13 OTHER MATTERS**

**13.1 SCR/2021/72 – Screening opinion for coastal flood defence works at Red Wharf Bay, Penraeth**

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee for information only. Further to an application submitted on behalf of Isle of Anglesey County Council for a Screening Opinion as to whether an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

was required in relation to proposals for coastal flood defence works at Red Wharf Bay, it has been determined that an EIA is not required. The Screening Opinion was issued on the 22 January, 2022.

**It was RESOLVED to accept the report for information only.**

**COUNCILLOR NICOLA ROBERTS  
CHAIR**