

# PLANNING AND ORDERS COMMITTEE

## Minutes of the virtual meeting held on 6 July, 2022

- PRESENT:** Councillor Neville Evans (Chair)  
Councillor Glyn Haynes (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors Geraint Bebb, Jeff Evans, Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE, John I. Jones, Jackie Lewis, Dafydd Roberts, Ken Taylor, Alwen P. Watkin, Robin Williams
- Local Members: Councillors Paul Ellis (application 7.6) Dyfed Wyn Jones (application 7.7) Llinos Medi (application 7.3), Alun Mummery (applications 7.7 and 12.4), Dafydd Rhys Thomas (applications 7.4 and 7.10)
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Development Management Manager (RLJ)  
Senior Planning Officer (CR)  
Senior Planning Officer (JBR)  
Development Management Engineer (Highways) (WIH)  
Legal Services Manager (RJ)  
Committee Officer (ATH)
- APOLOGIES:** Councillors Robert Llewelyn Jones, Liz Wood
- ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor Nicola Roberts (Portfolio Member for Planning, Public Protection and Climate Change), Chief Planning Officer (DFJ) (from 2:00 p.m.), Business Systems Manager (EW)
- 

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were noted as listed above.

### 2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were made as follows –

Councillor Dafydd Roberts declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 7.2 on the agenda.

Councillor Glyn Haynes declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 12.5 on the agenda.

Having sought and received advice from the Legal Services Manager, Councillor Ken Taylor also declared a personal and prejudicial interest with regard to application 12.5 on the agenda.

Councillor Llinos Medi (not a member of the Committee but in attendance as a Local Member) declared a personal interest with regard to application 7.1 and was not present when the matter was discussed.

### 3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous virtual meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 15 June, 2022 were presented and were confirmed as correct.

#### **4. SITE VISITS**

The minutes of the virtual site visits held on 15 and 29 June, 2022 were presented and were confirmed as correct.

#### **5. PUBLIC SPEAKING**

There were Public Speakers in respect of applications 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9 and 12.5

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

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

#### **7. APPLICATIONS ARISING**

##### **7.1 OP/2021/10 – Outline application for the erection of 10 dwellings with associated access, internal access road and parking together with full details of access and layout on land adjacent to Tyn y Ffynnon, Llanerchymedd**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders having been called in by a former Local Member due to the concerns of residents and Community Council members about the likely loss of expedited parking.

At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022 the Committee resolved to undertake a site visit. A virtual site visit was subsequently held on 22 June, 2022.

##### *Public Speaker*

Sioned Edwards, Cadnant Planning addressed the meeting in support of the application saying that the proposed development for 10 dwellings would help meet the demand for housing on the Island locally; two of the 10 units would be affordable and would be made available for local people only and they would remain so in perpetuity. The application site has been designated for housing within the Joint Local Development Plan (JLDP) meaning that the principle of providing a residential development on the site has been considered and accepted. The proposal offers a mix of homes to attract families, couples and older people with provision for both houses and bungalows. The proposed housing mix has been assessed and is acceptable to the Council's Housing Service. Sioned Edwards said that while the original scheme had been for 16 residential units, it emerged during consultation with Welsh Water at the pre application stage that only 10 units could be accommodated by the water treatment network in the area. The other main issue arising was the loss of and impact of informal parking available to local residents on the road at the front of the site. Throughout the process the applicant and agent have sought to work with the Community Council and the Highways Service to make changes to the application in order to provide parking provision for those Llanerchymedd residents who currently park along the front of the site. It should be noted that these are not formal parking spaces and those cars are at present parked on the roadside. The proposal has now been amended to provide 12 formal on-site parking spaces to replace the informal parking lost at the front of the site. A late request by the Highways Service is that 3 of the parking spaces be moved closer to the highway; however this is not possible without having a damaging impact on the setting of the remainder of the site. Every effort has been made to improve the parking situation for current residents and the applicant can do no more in this respect. The proposal offers an improvement on the current situation for both residents and road users and it is considered the application is acceptable in terms of parking and road safety. It is therefore hoped the Committee is able to support the application.

The Development Management Manager confirmed that the principle of the provision of residential development on this site has been assessed and considered acceptable and that the other main issue has been parking provision. The original details submitted for approval provided for a total of 21 parking spaces spread across residential units on the site. Following comments made by the Highways Service, the scheme was amended to provide a total of 22 spaces associated with the residential units with a further 6 visitor spaces on site. The site boundary along the B1152 was also amended to allow for a further 6 parking spaces along the road which is considered to represent a significant improvement as it creates purposeful parking spaces whereas currently cars are parked on the highway. The reduction in the number of units on site as a result of concerns raised by Welsh Water about the capacity of the area's drainage network to accommodate the original 16 units has allowed the applicant to address the parking concerns raised and it is considered that the proposal now provides an appropriate number of parking spaces. Extensive discussions have taken place to try to mitigate the impacts on parking and it should be noted that parking is a problem currently and that the situation will be improved rather than exacerbated by the proposed development due to the applicant's efforts to provide additional spaces. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Jackie Lewis in acknowledging the efforts made by the applicant in discussions with the Highways Service to overcome the parking issues arising in connection with the application which she was grateful for, commented that she would like to see the Highways Service continue those discussions with the Community Council in relation to ongoing parking issues in other estates in Llanerchymedd as well as the hazards caused by heavy traffic in the area. Councillor Ken Taylor likewise highlighted parking and traffic as recurring problems affecting most communities on the Island. He expressed appreciation for the applicant's endeavours in this instance and like Councillor Jackie Lewis was keen for the dialogue with the Council and the Community Council to continue to take matters forward.

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 and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein and the completion of a Section 106 agreement to secure obligations with regard to the provision of affordable housing and a financial contribution towards the provision of suitable off-site parking space in lieu of direct provision within the development site.**

## **7.2 FPL/2021/370 – Full application for amendments to planning permission reference FPL/2019/212 for the conversion of the outbuilding into holiday let accommodation at Chwarelau, Brynsiencyn**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022, the Committee resolved to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation with the stated reasons being the unsuitability of the parking arrangements – the new parking arrangement being deemed dangerous with no provision for turning within the site and the location of the passing bay on a dangerous blind corner with no visibility. The previously approved parking scheme and passing bay arrangement were considered to be safer and more acceptable.

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

The Development Management Manager reported that the Highways Authority has confirmed that the proposed parking area and passing bay are acceptable with consideration having been given to the existing level of traffic using the single track road as well as to the

proposed use of the passing bay with the view being that these factors do not warrant objecting to the location of the passing bay that has been constructed. Based on the Highways Officer's professional opinion that the proposal is acceptable in relation to the need identified in the previous planning application, the recommendation remains to approve the application. The Development Management Manager highlighted that should the Committee be minded to keep to its previous decision of refusal contrary to the Officer's recommendation, the applicant is entitled to appeal the decision and if successful could claim costs against the Council if the decision is deemed unreasonable.

Councillor John I. Jones, a Local Member in this respect whilst confirming that he had no objection to the proposed changes to the building reiterated his concerns regarding the location of the passing bay which was to have been originally sited on a straight stretch of road with plenty of visibility on both sides. The original location would have afforded motorists at least 50m to slow down either way and pull into the passing bay. The actual siting of the passing bay on a blind corner 50 metres away from its original location affords little or no visibility and raises issues of road safety and is in contravention of condition (06) of the planning permission. Further, the proposed new parking arrangements provide little room for four vehicles to manoeuvre safely onto the road whereas the original scheme provided for a turning space within the curtilage of the building. Councillor Jones also highlighted issues with the status of the road and whether or not it is private or adopted which is an added complication especially as the parking spaces are attached to it. He was concerned about it being unadopted and the implications of approving a parking scheme attached to a road whose legal status is unclear; he also sought clarification of the speed limit for an unclassified road. Given these concerns he proposed that the Committee reaffirm its previous refusal of the application.

The Development Management Manager advised that the status of the road is not a consideration for this application and he noted that the road serves four properties and is not a through road for traffic.

The Legal Services Manager said that he understood that the road is a highway but is unadopted and that the Highways Authority has provided an opinion on the application on that basis. In respect of the Committee's reasons for objecting to the application he advised with regard to the parking arrangement that there are no issues if vehicles are reversed into the parking spaces. If they have to exit by reversing onto the road then consideration needs to be given to the volume of traffic on the road and he suggested that the risk of collision would likely be greater on a housing estate than in a quiet countryside location such as this. As regards the location of the passing bay, in the interest of avoiding a collision having the passing bay on a corner of a narrow road where it would serve to widen the road may be more helpful than having it on a straight section of road where the visibility allows ample time to slow down. If the Committee is still minded to refuse the application, it needs to consider whether the justification it gives is sufficiently robust in an appeal situation and in order to avoid cost consequences; based on the reasoning at present he believed that not to be the case.

The Highways Engineer clarified that the speed limit for an unclassified road by general rule of thumb is 60mph. He confirmed that discussions about the status of the road are ongoing and that the Highways Authority has dealt with the application on the basis of the road being a private road.

Councillor Jeff Evans proposed, seconded by Councillor Robin Williams that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation stating that the Highways Authority has raised no objection on the grounds of safety and that he believed the application would be granted on appeal.

Councillor Ken Taylor seconded the proposal that refusal be reaffirmed highlighting that the applicant has acted in contravention of the planning condition.

In the ensuing vote the proposal that the application be approved was carried.

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

*(As the meeting had now been in progress for three hours – applications 7.1, 7.4, 7.5, 7.7, 7.8, 7.9 and 12.5 having been taken under item 5 (Public Speaking) in the order of business - in accordance with the requirements of para. 4.1.10 of the Constitution the Chair asked the Members present whether they wished the meeting to continue. A majority of those Members present voted for the meeting to continue.*

### **7.3 FPL/2021/349 – Full application for the creation of a private equestrian manège together with the change of use of agricultural land into an all year camping site at Caearau, Llanfairynghornwy**

The application was called in to be determined by the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member who expressed concern that the scheme would be tantamount to overdevelopment of the site. At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022 the Committee resolved to visit the site. A virtual site visit was subsequently conducted on 29 June, 2022.

The Development Management Manager reported that the key issues with regard to the application as raised by the Local Member and residents relate to the principle of the development; the proposal's effect on the Listed Building; traffic; ecology and the impact on an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Under the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan, Policy TWR 5 supports the creation of new camping sites provided they conform to the seven criteria set out therein and listed in the Officer's report. Having assessed the application against those criteria, it is considered that the location of the proposal is acceptable and is sufficiently screened from public view. The principle of the development is therefore acceptable and complies with Policy TWR 5. Traffic generated by the development was a major concern for local residents and for the Local Members. This being so it was requested that a transport survey be carried out to assess current and potential traffic and the capacity of the highway network to accommodate this traffic. The survey was subsequently undertaken on an Easter Bank Holiday weekend and having been completed it was found that the traffic generated by the proposed development and the 9 holiday lodges on site would not have a material impact on the surrounding highway network. The Highways Authority had no further objection to the scheme. As regards the effect on the Listed Building and the AONB, the Council's Heritage Officer is of the opinion that the private manège would not materially affect the setting of the listed building on site. The Officer also considered that the landscaping scheme submitted provides sufficient mitigation to prevent harm to the setting of the listed building adjoining the proposed camp site. Likewise the Trees and Landscape Officer is satisfied with the Landscaping Scheme and considers that the proposal conserves the natural beauty of the AONB in line with Policy AMG 1 of the JLDP. It is considered that the proposal conforms to all relevant policies of the JLDP and that it will not cause any material harm to the local highway network; the proposal is therefore acceptable and the recommendation is to approve the application.

Councillor Llinos Medi, a Local Member informed the Committee that Cylch y Garn Community Council objects to the development and has had a meeting with the developer to discuss the same. She pointed out that a similar application in another area was refused over a year ago because of the impact on the AONB and she questioned whether the effects on the AONB had been given sufficient consideration in this instance. Also, an issue raised

with the other similar application that was refused was the impact of car journeys to and from the site by visitors and site users contrary to the provisions of Policy PS4 and 5 of the JLDP. She was particularly concerned by the impact of the proposal on the local road network and despite the findings of the traffic survey, she highlighted that a number of previous applications for holiday units had been approved for this site which have yet to be developed which will increase the traffic in the area. She queried the consistency of decision making especially as this proposal is also in the countryside served by a network of small rural roads. Although each application on the site has been considered on its own merits, collectively they have transformed a historically agricultural site into a holiday complex and because they have been submitted individually their cumulative impact on the area has not been considered sufficiently. She asked the Committee to give careful consideration to the application in the context of the cumulative impact both of the proposal and the movement of visitors on the AONB and the area's road network.

Councillor John I. Jones referred to application FPL/2019/223 which in his view seemed to be a "carbon copy" of the application under consideration, which was refused thus giving him too concern about the consistency of decision making. The 2019 application was considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the area which is part of the AONB and was also considered not to conform to Policies TWR5, PCYFF 3 and 4, AMG 1 or 3 i.e. the application was assessed against the same policies of the JLDP and was found not to be compliant. Further, the proposal was seasonal and had links to sustainable travel modes. Councillor Jones suggested that it would be helpful to defer the current application to allow a comparison to be made with application FPL/2019/223.

The Development Management Manager advised that all applications are considered on their own merits and all relevant officers have been consulted on the current application in terms of impacts on the AONB, heritage and highways and their professional views have been taken into account. He advised that it may not be appropriate to compare two applications in two different areas where the influencing factors may be different. In response to a question about potential light effects, he confirmed that the manège is for the private use of the property and that no lighting impacts would result from it.

Councillor John I. Jones proposed, seconded by Councillor Ken Taylor that the application be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation. In response to a request for clarification by the Legal Services Manager of the grounds for refusal and further, whether the intention is to refuse the application or to defer it to allow for a comparison to be made with the application cited as similar, Councillor John I. Jones confirmed that he was happy for a comparison of the two applications to be made during the next month and he amended his proposal accordingly to one of deferment to that end and was seconded by Councillor Ken Taylor. Councillor Jeff Evans agreed that deferment would be preferable to allow further examination to take place and to gain a better understanding of the position.

**It was resolved to defer consideration of the application to allow the Officers time to compare the application with application FPL/2019/223 and report back.**

#### **7.4 FPL/2021/160 – Full application for change of use of residential dwelling (Class Use C3) into hot food takeaway business (Class Use A3) with alterations to vehicular access at Bryn Bela, Lôn St Ffraid, Trearddur Bay**

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

At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022, the Committee resolved that a site visit was required. A virtual site visit was subsequently undertaken on 29 June, 2022.

*Public Speaker*

Sioned Edwards, Cadnant Planning in her address to the Committee said that a planning application for a similar development was previously refused and the application was now being re-submitted with amendments and additional information to overcome the previous reasons for refusal which were in relation to the unacceptable impact on the residential amenities of nearby properties by virtue of noise and general disturbance; the lack of customer parking and the lack of information on how consideration has been given to the Welsh language.

In terms of the impact on residential amenities and the character of the area, changes made to the application include the removal of the outside seating area and the erection of an acoustic fence along the boundary with the neighbouring property. Lengthy discussions have taken place with Officers who are now satisfied that there will be no detrimental impact on the amenities of nearby properties. Lôn St Ffraid has a mixture of properties including houses, shops, restaurants and a garage. The area is not solely residential and it is not considered that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on the character of the area.

Sioned Edwards referred to detailed discussions having taken place with the Highways and Planning Officers on the issue of parking. The amended plans now include staff and customer parking spaces at the front and rear of the property although it is expected that the number of staff with cars will be low as the majority will be young people from the local area most whom are not yet able to drive. The Highways Department is satisfied with the parking provisions which are in line with the SPG.

With reference to the Welsh language, the development will provide opportunities for local people, including Welsh speakers. There is no chip shop in Trearddur Bay and the proposal will lead to money being spent in the village rather than losing out to nearby villages. There will be bilingual signs in the shop. The Officer recommends approving the application and she hoped the Committee would also be able to support it.

The Development Management Manager referred to the main planning issues as set out in the Officer's report stating that one of the reasons for refusal of the previous application was the impact on the occupants of nearby properties from noise and general disturbance. The current application incorporates several amendments in an effort to overcome these issues as detailed in the Officer's report. The takeaway's opening hours will also be restricted. Given the amendments and the mitigation measures proposed as well as the planning conditions that would be imposed on the consent if approved, it is not considered that the proposed development will have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupants of the adjacent dwellings.

The current application has been further amended to provide two car parking spaces at the front of the property and a further five spaces will be available at the rear. The two spaces along with a single space at the rear will be made available for customers while the remaining four spaces are available for staff members. In order to access the parking space at the rear of the property, the existing garage will be reduced in size to allow sufficient vehicle movement. After assessing the amendments included within the current application, the Highways Authority is of the view that the parking arrangements comply with the SPG Isle of Anglesey County Council Parking Standards. In addition, on street car parking spaces are available in the vicinity and a public car park is situated 180 metres south of the site.

The Development Management Manager confirmed that the proposed development is considered acceptable on policy terms overcoming the previous reasons for refusal. The amendments incorporated as part of the current application include the provision of customer and staff parking spaces together with mitigation measures in an effort to safeguard the amenity of the neighbouring property. The recommendation is therefore one of approval.

Councillor Dafydd Rhys Thomas, a Local Member expressed his gratitude for all the work that had gone into amending the application and although he did not object to the proposal he thought it was sited in the wrong place and that it had not changed sufficiently to mitigate all the traffic issues in the area. That said he respected the Officer's professional view. Councillor Thomas also highlighted issues with regard to the Welsh language pointing out that the Business Plan accompanying the application had been prepared in English only and he sought assurance that the signage, menu and website would be bilingual.

Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE expressed reservations about the parking situation and thought that the proposed provision would not be enough to cater for the number of jobs both full and part-time which the proposal will create and that further work is needed to address the parking issue otherwise it will lead to more problems on what is a busy thoroughfare. He also pointed out that a small road leads to a bungalow behind the subject property to which no reference has been made. For reasons of parking and traffic therefore, he felt unable to support the application.

Councillor Jackie Lewis believed that there needs to be more of a push towards ensuring bilingualism especially in terms of signage and place/establishment names; she referred to a Welsh signage scheme which was managed in previous years by Menter Môn in conjunction with the Council which entailed working closely with the Planning Service to ensure bilingual signage. Sioned Edwards, Cadnant Planning agreed that there is a role for the Council, the applicant and the applicant's agent to do what they can to ensure that a Welsh name is provided for the business and she confirmed that the applicant has agreed to do so and will also provide a bilingual menu thereby ensuring that Welsh is prominent within the business. In response to a question about the business employing predominantly young people she further clarified that the reference was to those of sixth form/college age who take on jobs in restaurants/cafes/hotels locally many of whom do not have a car and would travel to the site by walking, bus or a lift.

The Development Management Manager confirmed that the Planning Service has no statutory power to enforce the use of the Welsh language but welcomed the applicant's commitment to do so voluntarily.

Councillor Jeff Evans proposed, seconded by Councillor Robin Williams that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation on the basis that the facility meets a public need in the area. Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes proposed, seconded by Councillor Ken Taylor that the application be refused because of parking and traffic concerns.

In the ensuing vote, the proposal to approve the application was carried.

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

#### **7.5 FPL/2021/266 – Full application for the erection of 8 affordable residential apartments, construction of vehicular access, construction of new road on site together with soft and hard landscaping on land adjacent to Garreglwyd Road, Holyhead**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee having been called in to be determined by the Committee at the request of a Local Member amid local concern for highway safety, overdevelopment of the site and the development's appearance in the locality.

At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022, the Committee resolved to visit the site. A virtual visit was subsequently conducted on 29 June, 2022.

The Development Management Manager reported that following concerns raised at Committee's previous meeting the applicant consented to commission a traffic survey; this has since been completed and was received by the Council yesterday. In light of this and to



allow the Highways Authority and Local Members time to consider the contents of the survey, it is recommended that consideration of the application be deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE that consideration of the application be deferred in line with the Officer's recommendation.

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

#### **7.6 FPL/2021/361 – Full application for the erection of a new foundation phase and child care unit, external play areas, car park and associated work on land adjacent to Ysgol y Graig, Llangefni**

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

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at its meeting held on 15 June, 2022 where Officers recommended that the Committee undertake a site visit. A site visit subsequently took place on 29 June, 2022.

The Development Management Manager reported that the scheme deals with schools in the Llangefni area as part of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Schools Modernisation Programme and proposes the construction of a new Foundation Phase Primary school Unit on land adjacent to the existing school. There is insufficient space to extend the existing school on the current site to meet the required capacity in the area. The solution is to relocate the Foundation Phase Unit into the proposed new unit thereby increasing the capacity of Ysgol Y Graig from 330 pupils to 480 pupils together with nursery and child care provision. The application site was selected as the most suitable, located adjacent to and within walking distance of the existing school site.

The site is located outside the development boundary of Llangefni but lies immediately adjacent to the development boundary and built form of the town. Development Plan policies support the creation of community buildings and resources within or on the edge of existing settlements with Policy ISA 2 – Community Facilities – being the main JLDP policy that deals with new community facilities. Policy ISA 2 is supportive of maintaining and improving community facilities and grants the development of new community facilities provided that they meet the criteria as set out in the Officer's report. It is considered that the proposal meets all the criteria of Policy ISA 2 of the JLDP.

With regard to traffic and parking, the proposed development provides a large car park which will cater for the new development and help resolve severe traffic issues at the existing Ysgol Y Graig and eliminate safety issues on the highways outside the school. The parking arrangements include 22 spaces for staff, 86 visitor/parent spaces with a total of 10 charging points within the car park. Also proposed are 20 parent/visitor spaces located around the existing access road and roundabout to the existing school site. A covered and lit cycle shelter will be provided outside of the main entrance which will cater for 10 bikes and within the school, an additional 40 lit cycle shelters will be provided for 40 bicycles. It is considered that the proposal offers a significant improvement on the current parking arrangements.

The impact of the proposal upon the amenity of nearby land users has been considered in accordance with the criteria set out in Policy CYFF 2 (Development Criteria) with particular reference to the effects on health, safety and amenity of occupiers of local residences or other land and property users. A Noise Impact Assessment has been provided with the planning application to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Section which agrees with its findings. It is not considered that the proposed new school will have any impact on the residential properties located nearest the site.

With regard to drainage regarding which some concerns have been raised locally, as of 7<sup>th</sup> January, 2019, all new developments of more than one property or where the construction

area with drainage implications is 100m<sup>2</sup> or more are required to have sustainable drainage systems to manage on site surface water in accordance with mandatory standards for sustainable drainage published by Welsh Ministers. Neither Welsh Water nor Natural Resources Wales have raised objections regarding the proposal. In conclusion, the proposal for the erection of a new foundation phase and child care unit, external play areas, car park and associated work on land adjacent to Ysgol Y Graig, Llangefni complies with all relevant policies and is acceptable having weighed the material considerations as set out in the Officer's report. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Paul Ellis, a Local Member highlighted local concerns reading the proposal particularly from a parking, traffic and pedestrian perspective. He raised issues with the proposed parking arrangements which he felt were insufficient to address the serious and hazardous traffic congestion around the existing school especially around the back roundabout which has necessitated a police presence at times. A traffic survey of the road leading to Ysgol Y Graig showed a pattern of usage of 200 cars in the morning and over 200 cars in the afternoon from 3 p.m. onwards (not taking into consideration the traffic to be generated by the new school block). He was also concerned by the fact that there would be two site entrances as the result of the new school meaning there would be two drop off points for parents with children of different ages potentially leading to a chaotic situation. A third concern was the proposed path connecting the two school sites which the local community believe to be dangerous as its exit is at the busy back roundabout – the community is looking for a safer solution than that proposed by the application.

The Development Management Manager advised that the Council has consulted with the community and others to ensure the sufficiency of the parking arrangements. The 86 spaces for visitors and 22 spaces for staff which the proposal provides to address the current parking and safety issues represent a significant over provision the statutory requirement being 2 spaces per classroom. The path connecting the two school sites crosses the woodland but is not on the main highway.

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 and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein.**

### **7.7 FPL/2021/267 – Full application for the erection of holiday lodge together with associated works at Plot 13, Pentre Coed, Menai Bridge**

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

At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022, the Committee resolved to visit the site. A virtual site visit subsequently took place on 29 June, 2022.

#### *Public Speaker*

Ann Rhian Hughes, an objector to the application said she was speaking on behalf of neighbours who live in the vicinity of the Plas y Coed development and who over the course of recent years have opposed the various phases of this development including the 8 holiday lodges, a further development of 4 houses and this the latest proposal making 13 houses in the Anglesey countryside. Ms Hughes said she was referring to them as houses because that is what the latest development is – a substantial housing estate. Over the years 13 applications have been submitted which have changed the nature of the 4 houses that have been newly completed. They are completely different to that which was originally permitted and step by step, the planning conditions have been deleted leading to houses which are oppressive and this without the addition of another unit. What is worse is that Planning Officers have allowed the owners of these houses and lodges to live there all year round

without any obstacles or monitoring. While Cadnant Planning notes in their Welsh Language Assessment document that one additional unit will not have any lasting impact on the language, people do live in these houses permanently and have done so despite a condition stipulating that they should not be used as a main or permanent residence and the risk is that this is what will happen in the case of this application and other holiday home estates on Anglesey. The influx of people into the countryside has intensified recently and when the number of people residing in what Cadnant Planning calls established lodge sites is taken into account, the crisis is worse than one thinks with second homes spreading from the coast into the countryside as in the case of Pentre Coed as highlighted in Simon Brookes' report to Welsh Government. Ms Hughes referred to the narrow winding road to Pentre Coed and to drainage issues on site which would be exacerbated by the current proposal and highlighted that although Cadnant Planning states that the holiday unit would be developed by a company employing Welsh language speaking workers, Omega the company which has been undertaking works in Pentre Coed, is a company from England. In addition, it is only in the amended application that any mention is made of adapting the unit for a person with special needs and none of the other homes seem to have been considered for similar adaptation. Cadnant Planning in its Business Plan states that Pentre Coed Holiday Park will improve and protect the Welsh Language and culture and will sustain local rural communities while providing opportunities for young people; Ms Hughes said that in her view being able to buy, rent or build homes in their community would really protect Welsh language and culture and at present young people face innumerable obstacles in trying to do so.

Sarinha Farook, Cadnant Planning spoke in support of the application saying that the application site comprises land that already forms part of the holiday park and has been used as a temporary compound and storage area. When viewed the plot forms natural extension to the built form within the park and the addition of a holiday lodge in this location would not look out of place in the context of its surroundings as it would match the design, scale and layout of the other lodges on site. The proposal is for the addition of one lodge only and therefore the development would not result in any significant impact upon the existing road network and infrastructure in the area. The lodges in Pentre Coed Holiday Park are used for holiday purposes only and if permitted the proposed development would have a condition attached to ensure that the occupation of the unit would be for holiday purposes only. The holiday lodge is specifically sought for an individual with specific needs. There is currently a lack of provision of holiday accommodation within rural North Wales for visitors with disabilities and the proposed development would help address this gap in the market and would allow for this individual to continue to visit rural North Wales despite his disability. The proposal would also support local rural business which in turn would support the local rural economy through knock-on benefits brought about by the tourist industry. The proposed lodge would be sited a considerable distance from any residential dwelling and would not result in any adverse impact on residents in the area. Cadnant Planning consider that the application should be approved.

The Development Management Manager reported that the key issue is whether the proposal complies with relevant local and national planning policies with Policy TWR 2 being the main policy in this case. Policy TWR 2 relates to holiday accommodation and states that proposals will be permitted provided they are of a high quality in terms of design, layout and appearance and conform to the relevant policy criteria. Given its scale and its location on an established holiday lodge park it is considered that the proposal complies with criteria (i), (ii) and (iv). Criterion (v) of Policy TWR 2 requires that the proposal does not lead to an over-concentration of such accommodation within the area. The most recent council tax data shows that the proportion of second homes and self-catering holiday accommodation in the Menai Bridge community council area amounts to 8.23% which is lower than the 15% threshold set out in the SPG. This being an application for one lodge only, the Highways Authority has raised no objection. The application also includes a Landscaping Scheme which will improve the biodiversity of a site that is currently being used as a compound. The

proposal is considered to be compliant with relevant development plan policies and is acceptable in terms of siting and design, and it is not considered that it would be detrimental to highway safety or the amenities of neighbouring properties. With reference to the objections to the proposal, the Development Management Manager advised that these have focused on the present usage of the lodges which is not the subject of the current application; any concerns about usage should be brought to the attention of the Enforcement team. In addition, condition (02) is intended to ensure that the proposal will be used as short term holiday accommodation and not occupied as a sole or primary residence and also requires that a register of occupiers be kept at the lodge to this end. As the Planning Service cannot monitor each and every holiday home on the Island, such a register is essential in the event of an inspection. It is not considered that the proposal will have an adverse impact on the Welsh language as it is only for a single lodge and not a permanent residential home and whilst the report by Simon Brookes to which reference has been made deals with the impact of second homes rather than holiday accommodation, the Council's SPG sets out a threshold of 15% for the proportion of second homes and holiday accommodation in any community and/or/town council area for the purpose of safeguarding the Welsh language and rural communities. The percentage of holiday accommodation and second homes in Menai Bridge falls well short of this threshold. Taking all these factors into consideration therefore, the recommendation is to approve the application.

Councillor Alun Mummery speaking as a Local Member in saying that the proposal is for much more than a lodge referred to the fact that there have been 9 applications since the original application was granted on appeal and no reference is made in the report to how the original 4 lodges have grown into 12. Planning Officers state that there is no permission for the lodges to be used as permanent residences even though there are allegations that this is the case. He expressed concern about how the proposed register would be monitored and enforced saying that if no inspection system is implemented then the lodges will become permanent residences. He believed it to be a classic example of how easy it is to delete planning conditions.

Councillor Dyfed Wyn Jones, also a Local Member in agreeing with Councillor Alun Mummery said that a number of piecemeal changes in the end lead to a very big change and that is the concern locally with regard to the application site. To the left of the site are lodges and to the right are what can only be described as houses and this should be taken into consideration.

Councillor Robin Williams said that the park has over time grown from a small development into something that has trebled the number of houses on what is a narrow road from the Penmynydd road to the Pentraeth road exiting from which has now become almost impossible. This being so it is not sensible to be increasing the number of units on this site still further. The site and the series of developments on it have been the subject of dispute over many years. He thought the proposal for a thirteenth unit constituted an over development of a site in the countryside and should not be supported on that basis.

In considering the application the Committee sought clarification of the legislation in relation to holiday occupancy and sought assurance also that occupancy conditions are able to be monitored and enforced by the Planning Authority to ensure that units meant as short term holiday accommodation are not eventually occupied permanently as someone's home.

The Development Management Manager confirmed that the while the principle of monitoring is important to the Planning and Enforcement services, to be able to carry that out in practice for every holiday accommodation on the Island is not possible. Many of the concerns raised e.g. the current use of the lodges are outside the scope of the application and while the application site has been the subject of a number of applications, each application has been considered individually on its own merits. As regards the length of time holiday accommodation can be occupied the stipulation was for 10 months of the year but guidelines now allow for up to 12 months occupation providing the holiday accommodation is not the

primary or permanent residence. The Officer further confirmed that the proposal complies with the SPG in relation to the adjacent property known as Efail Newydd and that the Highways Authority is also satisfied with the proposal.

Sarinha Farook, Cadnant Planning clarified that all the lodges on site are used as holiday homes be that as a rented holiday home or second home.

Councillor Jeff Evans said that he thought that the greatest benefit to be derived from holiday homes is from their being occupied rather than lying empty and that 12 month occupation is not therefore in contravention of the law. If the Planning Service does not have the capacity to monitor occupation then the condition is unenforceable. He proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Dafydd Roberts seconded the proposal.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be refused as contrary to Policy TWR 2 by virtue of its scale within its location. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Alwen Watkin. In the ensuing vote the proposal to approve the application was carried.

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

**7.8 FPL/2021/317 – Full application for the demolition of an existing three storey building comprising two residential flats and ground floor ancillary residential storage and the construction of a replacement three-storey building comprising two residential flats and a 10 room hotel with associated ground floor restaurant and water sports facility for guests and associated parking at Cumbria and High Wind, High Street, Rosneigr**

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

At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022, the Committee resolved that a site visit was required. A virtual site visit was subsequently undertaken on 29 June, 2022.

*Public Speaker*

Mr Andrew Dawson an objector to the application said that while there are well documented general reasons for objecting to the proposal including the increased traffic on an already chaotic high street, blind access on the road opposite the library, insufficient parking for the development particularly the restaurant and shop elements and the clear noise disturbance such a development will create, his main concern was the impact on his and his wife's privacy and enjoyment of their home as the owner of the adjoining property. He disagreed with the Planning Service's assessment that there will be no adverse impact on the amenity of the neighbouring property i.e. his property as there is a shared wall with the development which if approved, is to be demolished and rebuilt twice as high in places with windows inserted into the wall and directly overlooking his property. He accepted that the current building is an eyesore and needs to change but thought that the propped development is completely over the top and unsuited to the quaint seaside village of Rhosneigr. There is no need for a 10 bed hotel restaurant and surf shop when there are an increasing number of holiday lets available, at least 10 catering establishments and 2 surf shops which are ample for the size of Rhosneigr. In its current form the proposed development would be overbearing and overwhelming for his own property and the proposal to put a window directly in the shared wall albeit a privacy window some 6 feet away from the dining room and kitchen windows is surely not allowable. Furthermore, the proposed rear balcony directly adjoins and overlooks his own property's patio where he and his wife eat and entertain. Also the proposed development's roof appears to overhang his property which he felt was not legally allowed.

Mr Nick Smith of Emery Planning spoke in support of the application as a proposal that would create a high quality hotel within a central location of the village and improve the

provision of serviced accommodation in the area. The local plan acknowledges that the area lacks an adequate range of such accommodation and the proposal would assist in meeting that need. The proposal would make sufficient use of previously developed land in a sustainable location. A detailed business plan has been submitted with the application which confirms that the hotel would be commercially attractive and viable and would make significant economic and community contributions to the locality.

The building would occupy the same footprint as the existing building and would be no higher. It would be a contemporary design providing high quality development in the centre of the village, there would be no harm to the character and appearance of the area. The building has been designed to ensure there would be no adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties including the dwelling to the south. It should be noted that there are clear views into the property at present from existing windows and balconies. Amended plans have been submitted to ensure there would be no adverse impact on amenity; balconies have been carefully positioned and screened to ensure there would be no loss of privacy including the house to the south. The car park is well contained by existing buildings and would not result in any loss of amenity.

Mr Smith referred to the parking arrangements confirming that the 10 parking spaces proposed for the hotel comply with the Council's guidelines; an additional 4 spaces proposed for the apartments would be sufficient having regard to the location and type of units proposed. There would be sufficient space for all vehicles to enter and leave in a forward direction without harm to highway safety.

The proposal would add to the choice of tourist accommodation in the village and create local employment opportunities and economic benefits. At all times the Welsh language has been kept at the forefront of the design team's mind and would be incorporated into the design including signage and restaurant menu. The Committee was requested to approve the application.

The Development Management Manager reported that the main JLDP policy in dealing with the proposed hotel development is Policy TWR 2. Criterion 2 of Policy TWR 2 states that proposals for the development of new permanent serviced or self-serviced holiday accommodation will be permitted provided they are of high quality in terms of design, layout and appearance and that all the five criteria listed in the Officer's report can be met. For the reasons detailed in the Officer's report it is considered that the proposal satisfies all five criteria and is therefore acceptable in policy terms.

In terms of site context the proposed building would reflect the existing pattern of design by continuing the three storey aspect and directly abutting the main highway. Although it is acknowledged that the site is limited as regards its area, planning policy puts emphasis on the need to make best and efficient use of land in particular on previous developed land in sustainable locations. Having given due consideration to the existing development and having received amended plans which reduce the bulk and scale of the building, it is considered that the proposed development can acceptably integrate into the site without appearing cramped or overdeveloped.

In relation to the impact of the proposal, the applicant has submitted amended plans in an attempt to overcome local concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on the amenities of nearby residential properties. In a development of this nature, some impacts will be created which may have a negative effect upon the amenity of neighbouring properties. However, having considered the existing building and its use as well as the mitigation measures proposed it is not considered the proposal will have a significant detrimental impact on the amenity of nearby properties. If approved, conditions will be attached to the permission to ensure the amenity of neighbouring properties are safeguarded.

The proposed development will include an area at the rear for car parking and manoeuvring. The car park will have a total of 14 car parking spaces with 10 spaces designated for hotel guests including 2 disabled bays and 4 for the occupiers of the residential units. The vehicle parking and manoeuvring area will be accessed from an existing access at Awel y Mor. A Transport Assessment has been submitted as part of the application and in response to concerns raised by the Highways Authority; a speed/volume survey was also submitted providing data and information with respect to the number of vehicle movements within the area. Having assessed the findings of the survey which showed there to be low intensity low speed operating conditions on Awel y Mor, the Highways Authority is satisfied that the access can provide suitable visibility to ensure the safe operation of this access point. Although the proposal provides 10 parking spaces in accordance with the SPG for new hotel development and provides an additional 4 parking spaces for the residential apartments, the jobs created by the development together with public use of the restaurant has been taken into consideration. Given the application site is within the development boundary and within very close proximity to the defined local centre and is considered to be in a sustainable location, it is not considered that any increase in parking would have such a significant negative impact on the available parking provision within the area. There are also public car parks and off street parking in the immediate vicinity. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

Councillor Ken Taylor referred to the current trialling of a one way traffic system in Rhosneigr and said that he felt unable to come to a determination on the application at this meeting until the conclusion and outcome of the trial is known. He was worried that any decision on the application made at this meeting could influence that outcome. He asked therefore whether a deferral was possible pending the outcome of the one way trial; failing that he would be opposing the application.

The Legal Services Manager advised that the Committee is required to assess the application in the context of the current situation; it would not be appropriate to defer determining the application to await the outcome of the consultation as the outcome of that process is beyond the control of applicant, and as it is not guaranteed the Committee would in effect be "penalising" the applicant for something over which he has no control. Approval of the application will in any case feed into the Highways Authority's assessment of the traffic situation at the end of the consultation process. The consultation is only one consideration of many that may contradict or confirm the impact of the proposal on the road network in the area.

The Highways Engineer in confirming that it was the Highways Authority's intention to retain the one way traffic system advised that there are two stages to the consultation the first with the Emergency Services has already commenced and will proceed to include Local Members and the Community Council. The subsequent stage will involve input by the public. In response to further comments he clarified that the first stage can take around five weeks and that a request has been received for a time extension until the end of August; the ensuing consultation with the public will take around three weeks meaning that a decision may not be made until mid-September.

Councillor Jeff Evans said that he could not see any advantage in deferring; given that the proposal provides 14 parking spaces linked to the hotel element and given the availability of public car parking nearby he didn't think the outcome of the consultation would have a material effect on the proposal.

The Chair speaking as a Local Member referred to the serious parking and traffic issues in Rhosneigr the situation having worsened during the pandemic. While some preferred to see a hotel rather than holiday homes in this location the main concerns regarding the development have been focused on the traffic situation and the access in and out of the site. It was his personal view that the parking provision offered would not resolve the matter as cars park on both sides of the road.

Councillor Jeff Evans proposed, seconded by Councillor Robin Williams that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Ken Taylor proposed, seconded by Councillor Geraint Bebb that the application be refused. In the ensuing vote the proposal to approve the application was carried.

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

### **7.9 FPL/2022/7 – Full application for the redevelopment of existing Caravan Park to accommodate static caravans and extension to site to accommodate touring caravan together with the erection of a toilet/shower block at Mornest Caravan Park, Pentre Berw**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee having been called in to be determined by the Committee at the request of a Local Member.

At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022, the Committee resolved to visit the site. A virtual site visit was subsequently conducted on 29 June, 2022.

#### *Public Speaker*

Mr Andrew Jones spoke in support of the application and provided background information about himself and his family as the third generation to be running the caravan park which was established fifty years ago by his grandparents. The park has been full for 8 years and so it was decided to embark on the journey to expand the park to ensure a livelihood for his family and create employment for others.

Mr Jones said that while the Planning Authority does not object to the first part of the application involving the provision of a new touring caravan site the proposal to change the use of 45 touring caravans into 38 static caravans is recommended for refusal. The original application was refused a year ago and following a meeting on site with the Principal Planning Officer the feedback was that an application should be made for a Certificate for Lawful Use and that landscaping improvements be made after which the Department would be willing to consider the change of use. Not for one second was feedback received that the number would be too high for the scheme in doing so.

The best way of measuring improvement is through Visit Wales which scores on the basis of location, facilities and landscaping features. The proposed improvements are enough to raise the park's score from 3 to 5 stars. The application is being refused on the basis of one part of Policy TWR 3 but the policy states that this is a general guide and that every application will be assessed according to its merits due to the considerable variety in the size, nature and location of sites. What makes this application unique is that the tourers have a Certificate of Lawful Use allowing them to be sited permanently on the land as statics and enabling them to be connected permanently to services in the same way as statics. In terms of size, tourers can be the same length as statics.

Policy TWR 5 defines a tourer as a unit whose physical connection to the ground is limited and which is capable of being moved from the site off season. With the Certificate of Lawful Use the permanent tourers contradict their definition in the policy thereby undermining the policy that refuses the application. Tourers should therefore be considered as permanent units. At present the park has 20 static and 45 permanent tourers, namely 65 permanent units. The application seeks approval for 58 static units which is in effect tantamount to a reduction in the number of permanent units within the same land boundary. There is no change in the visual impact from changing the tourers to statics.

Mr Jones referred to a recent application in Brynteg for change of use of 53 touring caravans to 49 statics which was similarly refused on the basis of the same part of Policy TWR 3. The application was granted on appeal. Mr Jones asked the Committee on the basis of the above to interpret the policy with common sense and in the context of the unique circumstances that apply in this case and to support the application.



The Development Management Manager reported that with regard to the principle of the touring caravan site Policy TWR 5 permits the creation of new touring caravan sites provided they adhere to the criteria listed in the Officer's report. The application site is considered to be well screened locally by topography, mature vegetation and other buildings. Views are most prominent directly outside of the site on the A5 highway; however screening planting has been carried out and their effectiveness will increase over time as they establish. Despite the open countryside location of the site as defined in the JLDP the area is well developed with several residential dwellings in the immediate vicinity and the Gaerwen industrial estate on the adjacent side of the highway. As such it is not anticipated that the proposal would significantly harm the visual quality of the landscape to the extent that would run contrary to the thrust of the policy. This being so it is considered that the touring element of the proposal is acceptable when considered against the criteria of Policy TWR 5 and the recommendation is to approve this part of the application.

In relation to the second element which is the static caravan site extension, Policy TWR 3 permits extensions to existing static caravan sites provided they adhere to the criteria listed in the Officer's report. Paragraph 6.3.74 of the JLDP states that outside Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Special Landscape Areas a minor increase in units on site may be approved if it can be demonstrated that the proposal offers significant landscape or environmental improvements to the site reducing its landscape and environmental impact. As a general rule an approximate 10% increase in the number of units at the original application is considered minor although each application will be assessed on its merit within this general guide due to the considerable variety in the size, nature and location of sites. At present there are 20 static caravans on site with the application proposing an additional 38 units which will take the total number of static caravans on site up to 58 units. This equates to a 190% increase in the number of units on site which far exceeds the 10% figure. It is not therefore considered that the proposed increase is at all minor in nature and it is therefore not considered that this element of the proposal conforms to policy TWR 3 and consequently the recommendation is that this part of the application be refused.

With regard to its effect upon amenity it is not considered that the proposal would give rise to negative effects upon residential amenity being situated at a distance of 84m from the nearest residential properties and, because of its proximity to bus stops and associated amenities, the proposal is considered to be in a sustainable location.

With regard to the reference made to a similar application in Brynteg that was granted on appeal, the Inspector did note at Paragraph 12 that relevant considerations had led him to conclude that a decision that is not compliant with Policy TWR 3 could be justified in this case. The Council must determine applications in accordance with the JLDP unless relevant considerations state otherwise. Even though there is no specific policy in the JLDP governing the change of touring caravans into statics, the guidance is clear that an increase of approximately 10% in the number of units is considered acceptable. The policy states that each application must be considered on its own merits because each site is different meaning that a 10% increase is not always acceptable. Although the Council recognises that the proposal in this instance entails the exchange of statics for tourers and that the applicant has a Certificate of Lawful Use, the Local Planning Authority has a duty to determine applications in line with policy.

Councillor Alwen Watkin speaking as a Local Member said that the applicant had worked closely with the Planning Authority over the course of 5 years and several site visits to make the application acceptable and many amendments have been made; at no time was there a suggestion that part of the proposal was unacceptable. She referred to the site being situated in a cleft and therefore not visible from the A55 nor A5 although the relocation of the new touring caravan site will increase its visibility but this is not opposed by Planning Authority. At present the site comprises 20 static caravans and pitches for 45 touring caravans and the proposal entails changing the 45 touring pitches to 38 static caravans. Councillor Watkin highlighted that the applicant is entitled to have the tourers on site

permanently throughout the year by virtue of the Certificate of Lawful Use and that their surface area is similar to that of a static caravan. In reality therefore the proposal reduces the number of caravans from 45 to 38. The JLDP supports local tourist developments. Although Policy TWR 3 states that proposals for new static caravan sites will be refused in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty in her experience large caravan parks owned by faraway companies seem to popping up like mushrooms all over the Island's coastline. This application is not in AONB. She referred to section 4 of policy TWR 3 and explained how in her view the proposal complies with the criteria listed in this section. She referred to the statement in Policy TWR 3 that each application will be assessed on its merits due to the considerable variety in the size, nature and location of sites and said that this was key in this instance. She referred also to the Brynteg application which was permitted on appeal and said that that was not the only decision to have been overturned on appeal with costs then awarded against the Council. Some objections to the proposal have been raised in the neighbourhood; however the nearest neighbour is the applicant's son who is fully supportive of the proposal. While some objections have been on the basis of potential noise disturbance, there are strict rules governing noise on caravan parks and owners can eject anyone guilty of creating a disturbance. This has only happened once in fifty years at Mornest Caravan Park. She asked the Committee to consider the application carefully and to remember that this is a Welsh family trying to make a living in their community.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts, also a Local Member said that the report addresses the concerns of the local community with regard to the touring caravan element of the proposal and that in any case the static caravan element of the proposal is out of sight. He therefore proposed that the application be approved in its totality i.e. the touring caravan site and the static caravan site extension contrary to the recommendation of the Officer. Councillor Jeff Evans seconded the proposal saying that he wanted Anglesey be an island that is welcoming to tourism; he thought the Committee should be supporting tourism especially as this is a family that has fifty years' experience in the tourism business.

Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE proposed seconded by Councillor Ken Taylor that the Officer's recommendation be adopted i.e. the touring caravan site be approved and the static caravan site extension be refused.

In the ensuing vote, the amendment put forward by Councillor Dafydd Roberts that the application be approved in its totality was carried with Councillors Geraint Bebb, Jeff Evans, Glyn Haynes, John I Jones, Jackie Lewis, Dafydd Roberts and Alwen Watkin voting for the amendment and Councillors Trefor Lloyd Hughes MBE, Ken Taylor and Robin Williams voting against.

**It was resolved to approve the application in totality contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the grounds that the static caravan site extension element was deemed to comply with Policy TWR 3.**

***In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution the application will be automatically deferred to the next meeting to allow the Officers to respond to the reason given for approving both parts of the application.***

#### **7.10 FPL/2022/63 – Full application for the erection of a food and beverage sales kiosk for ice cream, waffles and soft drinks at Ocean's Edge, Lon Isallt, Trearddur Bay**

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

At its meeting held on 15 June, 2022, the Committee resolved to approve the application. However, at the meeting the Officer inadvertently reported that the Highways Authority had been consulted and had raised no objection to the proposed development whereas in fact, the Highways Authority had not been consulted. Given the highway concerns raised by Members at the June meeting, the Planning Service on discovering that the Highways Authority had not been consulted informed the Chair and the two Local Members who

participated at the June meeting that Highways would be consulted and the matter reported again to the Committee. Having now been consulted, the Highways Authority confirms it has no objections to the scheme. The application is reported to the Committee in the interest of completeness, openness and transparency and to ensure that all matters have been taken into account in determining the application.

The Development Management Manager reminded the Committee that the proposal is made for the erection of a retail kiosk which will serve ice cream, waffles and soft drinks. It will be a subservient element to the existing restaurant on site and with a proposed floor area of 13m<sup>2</sup> is considered minor in scale. Due to the scale of the unit, it is not considered that the volume of generated business would be of such extent as to significantly harm nearby village shops and other businesses. No residential properties are located in the immediate vicinity of the site and the site will be accessible by local bus stops which are in close proximity. It is considered that the proposal conforms to Policy MAN 6 of the JLDP and the recommendation is therefore one of approval.

Councillor Dafydd Rhys Thomas, a Local Member said that although he did not envisage the proposal would add to the traffic problem in the area he did have reservations about its design from the perspective of the proposed cladding to be used which he thought was out of keeping with other buildings in the immediate vicinity. Of more significance was the ice cream van situated nearby which is a longstanding business recently taken over by a new proprietor – Councillor Thomas said that the proposal would be in competition with the ice cream van business potentially to the latter's detriment which he thought unfair given that the Ocean's Edge could sell ice creams from within its premises. Councillor Jeff Evans was in agreement and thought it very unfair that a busy restaurant would propose to open up an ice cream business within metres of the existing ice cream van business just when the new owner has invested in the lease. He highlighted that the Council will be receiving an income from the ice cream van business and he thought it was not right and reflected poorly on the Council to then "sell out" the ice cream van business to the restaurant.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation; in seconding the proposal Councillor Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE highlighted the recurrence of traffic and parking issues in a number of applications which he believed needed to be addressed policy wise in the long-term.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts proposed that the application be refused on the basis that it is contrary to Policy MAN 6 specifically where it states that proposals for small scale shops or extensions to existing shops outside development boundaries will be granted "if the shop will not significantly harm nearby village shops" which he thought applied equally in this instance the proposal being deemed to potentially cause harm to the ice cream van business. Councillor Jeff Evans seconded the proposal of refusal.

The Development Management Manager advised that competition is not a material planning consideration and that the Ocean's Edge restaurant could in any case sell ice cream from inside the premises without planning consent. With regard to Policy MAN 6 he advised that the policy is intended to apply to shops rather than mobile vans.

In the ensuing vote Councillors Geraint Bebb, Jeff Evans, Glyn Haynes, Jackie Lewis, Dafydd Roberts and Alwen Watkin voted to refuse the application and Councillors Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE, John I. Jones, Ken Taylor and Robin Williams voted to approve the application. The vote to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation was therefore carried.

**It was resolved to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the basis that it was deemed not to conform to Policy MAN 6 of the JLDP.**

***In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution the application will be automatically deferred to the next meeting to allow the Officers to respond to the reason given for refusing the application.***

## **8. ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS**

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

## **9. AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS**

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

## **10. DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS**

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

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

### **11.1 HHP/2022/163 – Full application for alterations and extensions at Tan y Garnedd, Lon Fferam Uchaf, Pentraeth**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the applicant is a "relevant officer" as defined within paragraph 4.6.10.2 of the Council's Constitution. The application has been scrutinised by the Monitoring Officer as required under paragraph 4.6.10.4 of the Constitution.

The Development Management Manager reported that the dwelling is a detached property situated within its own grounds. The proposal entails the construction of a pitched roof garage and sun room to the side elevation. The proposed extension is considered modest in terms of its size, scale and massing and can be accommodated within the applicant's land without resulting in over development of the site. The newly formed extension will not overlook neighbouring properties due to timber fencing and panelling and will not unacceptably impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties to such a degree to warrant refusal. The proposal fits in with the immediate area as regards scale and design and is considered to be compliant with the policies of the JLDP. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

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 and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein.**

## **12. REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS**

### **12.1 VAR/2022/36 – Application under Section 73 for the variation of condition (02) (submission of reserved matters) of planning permission reference OP/2019/6 (demolition of former chemical works and erection of 7 business units) so as to allow further time for the submission of the reserved matters at the former Peboc site, Llangefni**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it has been submitted by the Local Authority.

The Development Management Manager reported that there has been no change in circumstances or local policy since the outline permission was granted and so the variation of the condition to allow additional time for the submission of the reserved matters is therefore acceptable. The recommendation is therefore one of approval.

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 subject to the planning conditions contained therein.**

**12.2 FPL/2022/87 – Full application for the change of use of part of the former school playing field into a children's play area at Llangaffo Primary School, Llangaffo**

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

The Development Management Manager reported that former Llangaffo Primary School is located along the B4419 in the middle of the village. The former school building itself is located within the development boundary as defined by the JLDP whilst the playing field is located outside but adjoining the boundary. Access to the proposed playing field will be afforded via a wooden gate off the highway; the highway is paved throughout the village providing safe access to all users. The application site is considered to be in a sustainable location and is easily accessible on foot, by cycle or other means of transport. Although it is expected that most users will be local as the nearby villages of Gaerwen and Newborough have their own playing fields, the village hall located up the road could be used as a parking hub should people want to come to the playing field by car. Being a small scale development adjoining the development boundary and within a sustainable location, the proposal is considered to conform to Policy ISA 2 of the JLDP which is the relevant policy for assessing a community facility development of this type. The site is well screened and given the previous use of the land as a school playing field, it is not considered that the proposal will impact the neighbouring properties to such a degree as to warrant refusal. The recommendation is therefore to approve the application.

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 and report subject to the planning condition contained therein.**

**12.3 VAR/2022/3 – Application under Section 73A for the variation of conditions (05) (Manure Management Plan), (08) (Landscaping Scheme), (09) (TPO Tree Protection), (10) (Light Mitigation Strategy), (11) (Woodland Management Plan), (12) (Construction Environmental Management Plan), (17) (Archaeological Works), and (18) (Construction Traffic Management Plan) of planning permission reference FPL/2019/251/EIA (erection of a poultry unit) so as to allow the details to be submitted and approved following the commencement of development works at Cae Mawr, Llanerchymedd**

The application relates to the variation of conditions of consent of an application which was accompanied by an Environmental Impact Assessment. It is therefore referred to the Planning and Orders Committee for determination in accordance with paragraph 3.5.3.10 of the Council's Constitution.

The Development Management Manager reported that planning permission was granted in September 2021 for the development of a free range poultry unit to accommodate 32,000 chickens for egg production under planning permission FPL/2019/251/EIA. The permission remains extant and the development has commenced. There has been no change in policy since application FPL/2019/251/EIA was granted. The permission was subject to 18 conditions many of which required the submission of further details either prior to the commencement of the development or prior to being brought into use/operation and were intended to manage, mitigate and control the impacts of the development. Despite this the development commenced and has continued contrary to the advice of Officers and in breach

of several conditions of the permission. The S73A application is therefore submitted in order to vary the requirements of the conditions to allow the relevant details to be submitted and approved after the commencement of the development. In addition, the details required under the provisions of the relevant conditions have also been submitted as part of the application and as documented in the Officer's report. These details are considered acceptable by the Local Planning Authority meaning that Conditions (05), (08), (09), (10), (11), (12) (18) can be discharged and Condition (17) varied to require the further submission of a detailed SME report in fulfilment of part (b) of the condition, part (a) having been met.

Councillor Geraint Bebb 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 and report subject to the planning conditions contained therein.**

#### **12.4 FPL/2021/336 – Full application for alterations and extensions to health centre, the construction of new parking spaces together with soft landscaping at Llanfairpwll Health Centre, Penmynydd Road, Llanfairpwll**

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

Councillor Alun Mummery, a Local Member requested that a site visit be undertaken due to concerns about the lack of standard parking provision to meet the needs of the application.

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

**It was resolved to undertake a virtual site visit in accordance with the Local Member's request for the reason given.**

#### **12.5 FPL/2022/46 – Full application for the erection of 12 dwellings together with the creation of an internal access road and associated works on land near Bryn Glas Estate, Brynsiencyn**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member due to concerns regarding density and surface water along with highway concerns.

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

#### *Public Speaker*

Sioned Edwards, Cadnant Planning spoke in support of the application saying that the application is submitted by DU Construction who would be developing the proposed units on behalf of the County Council, all of which would be provided as affordable housing to meet a local identified need for this type of housing. The application site is within the development boundary of Brynsiencyn with residential housing to the north, east and south of the site and an open field to the west.

A Local Member has raised concerns about the density of the development and about surface water drainage and highways matters.

The development will provide 12 dwellings equivalent to a density of 31.6 housing units per hectare thereby satisfying Policy CYFF 2 of the JLDP which requires a minimum density of 30 housing units per hectare. Officers have raised no concerns on the basis of the density of the proposed development. Access to the site will be through the adjacent Bryn Glas estate. The application is accompanied by a Transport Statement which notes that the increase in vehicle movements as a result of the development would be very small. Each unit will have adequate parking provision and parking spaces will also be provided for visitors. A condition requiring the submission of a Construction Traffic Management Plan is included to minimise the impacts on nearby residents during the construction phase. The Highways Authority is satisfied with the proposal.

With regard to drainage concerns the development is not within a flood zone and surface water drainage would be via soakaways on site; SAB approval would be required prior to the commencement of works. Given the clear need for affordable housing in the area, it is hoped the Committee can support the application which will help in meeting that need.

The Development Management Manager reported that the main planning considerations in relation to housing, parking and highways, amenities and drainage have been outlined and addressed by the Public Speaker. Having confirmed that the proposal aligns with material policies and having weighed the material planning considerations, the Officer's recommendation is to approve the application.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts said that as a Local Member he was satisfied that concerns expressed with regard to the density of the development, drainage and highways issues had been addressed.

Councillor Jackie Lewis 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 subject to the planning conditions contained therein.**

### **13. OTHER MATTERS**

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

**Councillor Neville Evans  
Chair**