

# Planning and Orders Committee

## Minutes of the hybrid meeting held on 7 May 2025

- PRESENT:** Councillor Ken Taylor (Chair)  
Councillor Glyn Haynes (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors Geraint Bebb, Jeff M Evans, Neville Evans, T LI Jones MBE (left the meeting at 2.00 pm), John Ifan Jones, Jackie Lewis, Dafydd Roberts, Robin Williams.
- Councillor Nicola Roberts - Portfolio Member for Planning, Public Protection & Climate Change
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Planning Development Manager (RLJ),  
Legal Advisor (BB),  
Group Engineer (Development Control and Traffic Management) (AR),  
Team Leader (Planning) (GJ),  
Planning Assistant (CLG),  
Planning Assistant (DPS),  
Committee Officer (MEH),  
Webcasting Committee Services Officer (FT).
- APOLOGIES:** Councillor Jeff Evans
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Members: Councillors Margaret M Roberts (for application 10.1); Derek Owen (for application 12.2); Douglas M Fowlie (for application 12.6)

---

Due to technical difficulties the meeting was delayed until 1.05 p.m.

The Chair welcomed Mr Ben Burgerman, Legal Advisor from Brown Jacobson Solicitors to his first meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee.

### **1 APOLOGIES**

As noted above.

### **2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST**

Councillor Geraint Bebb declared a personal interest in respect of application 12.1 and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon.

Councillor John Ifan Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of application 12.7 and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon.

Councillor Douglas Fowlie (as a Local Member) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of application 12.6 and left the meeting following his representation as Local Member to the Committee.

The Planning Development Manager declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of application 12.1 and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon.

### **3 MINUTES**

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 2 April, 2025 were confirmed as correct.

### **4 SITE VISITS**

None considered by this meeting.

### **5 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

There were Public Speakers in respect of applications 10.1, 12.6 and 12.7.

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

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

### **7 APPLICATIONS ARISING**

### **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/2025/11 – Full application for the proposed erection of 9 open market dwellings and 19 affordable dwellings together with associated development on land adjacent to Maes Merddyn, Brynsiencyn**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the application has an open market element of the scheme which constitutes a departure from the Joint Local Development Plan by virtue of being outside of the development boundary, however due to the safeguarded fallback position on the site, the Local Planning Authority are minded to approve.

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

Mr Jamie Bradshaw, the applicant agent, **in support of the application**, said that the proposal is for an affordable led scheme to provide high quality homes to meet an identified housing need in Brynsiencyn. The scheme provides a mix of ‘traditional’ affordable homes and low-cost open market houses, this follows on from a previous development that was approved on the site for 13 houses, only 4 of which would be affordable, and with the majority being large detached executive style homes. That permission was started by the previous

owner of the site and so it is still alive, or extant, and could be completed at any time. The proposal is for 20 houses and 8 flats, with 19 of these being traditional affordable homes, and 9 being low-cost open market housing. The site is being developed for Clwyd Alyn, who would offer the houses for local people in affordable housing need. Importantly, there is a clear housing need for the dwellings which is confirmed by evidence in the Social Housing and Tai Teg housing registers, and so the development would make a valuable contribution to addressing the housing crisis in this part of the Island; the Planning and Housing Officers are entirely satisfied that there is a clear need for the scheme. The proposal includes a good quality access onto the A4080, and off-road parking within the site for the dwellings and visitors. There is capacity in the local road network to accommodate the development, and especially so when the extant permission on the site is accounted for, and the Highways Officers have not opposed the proposal. The proposed development would be a high quality and well landscaped scheme that would sit well within the locality and would be attractive and would also provide ecology mitigation for its limited impacts and achieve enhancements. This is confirmed by the Planning and Ecology Officers support for the scheme and NRW's stance on the application. A suitable drainage scheme is proposed for surface water, which will be dealt with entirely within the site; foul drainage would connect to the sewer in the road. Welsh Water are entirely satisfied with the drainage scheme as are the relevant Officers. All other statutory consultees have not opposed the scheme. However, it is noted that there are some concerns from local residents regarding impacts upon their privacy and amenity, but the development is well separated from its neighbours, more than meeting policy requirements. In addition, the permission that exists on the site must be considered which would have a similar impact to the proposal. Whilst there is some concern from a small number of local residents about the capacity of local services, the proposal will meet a local need for housing, and there is no objection from the Authority's Officers on this basis. Finally, contrary to the claims of there being flood risk on the site, NRW mapping shows no risk of flooding, and a suitable drainage scheme is proposed that will ensure that a surface water drainage system is put in place as part of the development that will ensure that it is suitably drained, this is confirmed by the consultation responses from Statutory Consultees with responsibility for flooding in the planning process. As such, there is no evidence to support the claim made, and so no weight can be placed upon it. The application seeks permission for a high-quality development that would assist in meeting the need for affordable and low-cost housing in this village and would make use of a site set within the built form of the village and which has an extant permission for residential development. All technical consultees are satisfied with the proposal, and Planning Officers are satisfied that it is an acceptable development that complies with planning policy.

The Planning Development Manager reported on the main considerations of the application and said that the site lies in the rural settlement of Brynsiencyn, which is defined as a Local Village under the provisions of the Joint Local Development Plan. The site occupies a position directly adjoining the A4080, which is the main highway servicing the Southwest of the Island. The site lies in the open countryside in policy terms; however, it is noted the

eastern boundary of the site is shared with the development boundary of the settlement. The site boundaries are currently defined by mature hedging with individual specimens of mature trees. It was also noted that the site benefits from a kerbed access which has been completed in recent years as means of making a material start to safeguard a previous planning consent. The site benefits from a valid and safeguarded fallback position for 13 dwellings under 37C26T/VAR and RM/2018/5, 4 of which being affordable. The proposal is for the erection of 28 dwellings on the site, 9 of which are open market, and the remainder (19 units) will be affordable. The development will consist of 8 single bedroom apartments, 13 two-bedroom dwellings, and 2 four-bedroom dwellings. The units will be a mix of open market and tenure neutral. All properties will be 2 storeys in nature and will be finished in slate roofs with rendered walls which will also include areas of timber/stone cladding. The site lies outside the development boundary of Brynsiencyn. Planning Policy TAI 16 of the development plan supports applications for affordable housing on sites adjoining the development boundary. With the exception of the 9 open market units which have extant permission, the development is 100% affordable and the application is supported by the submission of a housing statement, which demonstrates there is a clear and identified need in the local area for affordable housing. He further said that the site shares its Northern and Southern boundaries with the curtilages of other residential properties, with residential development also located to the east but separated by an agricultural enclosure. Subsequently, the department consider the site to be an infill plot and therefore a reasonable extension to the built form of the village. As regards to the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties it was noted that there is adequate distance as stated in the relevant planning policy and new fencing will be erect as well as a wildlife corridor between the site and the property to the north of the site. Several letters were received from local residents who raised concerns with the impact of the scheme as regards to increase traffic within the settlement, however, no such concerns were expressed by the Highways Authority who are satisfied with the ability of the local highway network to accommodate the scheme. He further referred that the site is not shown to be at risk of flooding and no concerns were received from neither Dwr Cymru nor NRW. The scheme will utilise brownfield land and an extant permission to provide 9 open market dwellings together with 19 affordable houses, which are made to address the local affordable needs of the settlement. The recommendation was of approval of the application.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts, and a Local Member said that during the first consultation as regards to the development of the site there were concerns that the dwellings would be all affordable houses and there are young local families that would prefer to buy a home or part ownership of housing in Brynsiencyn. He noted that this proposal has 9 open market units of one bedroom and questioned whether there is flexibility for some of the two/three bedroomed properties to be open market dwellings. The Planning Development Manager responded that the proposal affords a mix of affordable and open market dwellings, and the Housing Department have evaluated the need of social housing in the area. He noted that he would need to view the details of the application as regards to part ownership of the dwellings.

Councillor Jackie Lewis ascertained whether a Section 106 legal agreement will be a condition on the development and whether there will be a financial contribution towards the community and the local school. The Planning Development Manager responded that a Section 106 legal agreement will be a condition to ensure that the development is 100% affordable dwellings as the site is outside the development boundary. He noted that consultation has been undertaken with the Education Department, and they have responded that there is no need for a financial contribution as there are adequate capacity within the school to accommodate potential additional pupils.

Councillor Geraint Bebb proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts seconded the proposal of approval.

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

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

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

**12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS**

**12.1 HHP/2025/42 – Full application for the demolition of the existing garage together with alterations and extensions to Ael y Bryn, Rhostrehwfa, Llangefni**

*(Councillor Geraint Bebb declared a personal interest in application 12.1 and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon)*

*(The Planning Development Manager declared a personal and prejudicial interest in application 12.1 and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon)*

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the applicant is a relevant officer as defined in the Constitution. The planning application has been scrutinised by the Monitoring Officer.

The Team Leader reported that the proposal includes the demolition of a flat roof garage with the erect of a single storey flat roof extension which will link from the existing living room to provide a small utility, bathroom and a kitchen/dining area which will lead onto a patio which will be in the rear garden area. The proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and appearance and is in keeping with the property and the general form of development in the area and is of a high quality. The proposal therefore complies with planning policy PCYFF3. No trees or hedges will be removed as a result of the development and ecological enhancements have been included with the erection of 2 bird boxes and a bat box. It is considered that

the bird and bat boxes will enhance biodiversity and complies with Strategic Policy PS19, Policy AMG5 and advice contained within Planning Policy Wales Edition 12. The Highways Authority has confirmed that they have no objection to the proposal and are satisfied with the Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted with the application. She further said that the development will not have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring property to the south of the site and complies with the required distance from 8 Perth y Paen and Ceris. It is not considered that the proposal will have a negative impact upon the amenities of adjacent properties and complies with the distances set out in the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The recommendation was of approval of the application.

Councillor John Ifan Jones proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Robin Williams seconded the proposal of approval.

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

#### **12. 2 LBC/2025/6 – Listed Building Consent for the refurbishment of the main girl's toilet at Ysgol Syr Thomas Jones, Tanybryn, Amlwch**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the development is on land in the ownership of the Council.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the building at Ysgol Syr Thomas Jones is Grade II\* listed and the first purpose-designed comprehensive school in the post-war period. The application is for listed building consent for the refurbishment of the main girl's toilet block. Due to its deterioration, it is anticipated that the continued use of the existing main girl's toilet block could lead to safety and hygiene concerns for users. Having considered all options including repair and over cladding of the existing terrazzo both the Conservation Officer and CADW's Inspector of Historic Buildings agreed that the only functional solution was to remove the damaged terrazzo cubicles and replace with new modern safe and hygienic toilet facilities. However, it is recommended that a condition be applied that the existing terrazzo panels are to be carefully removed and securely stored on site for repairs to other terrazzo cubicles on site. It is intended for the salvaged terrazzo panels to be reused in other refurbishment projects within the school that are to be undertaken in the future thus preserving historic features where practical.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts seconded the proposal of approval.

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

**12.3 HHP/2024/169 – Full application for the erection of an ancillary annexe at The Old Crown, Moelfre**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member, as it is considered that the development would have a negative visual impact.

Councillor Margaret M Roberts, a Local Member requested a site visit to the site due to visual concerns of the development.

Councillor Geraint Bebb proposed that a site visit be conducted, and Councillor John Ifan Jones seconded the proposal.

**It was RESOLVED that a site visit be undertaken in accordance with a Local Member's request.**

**12.4 HHP/2025/20 – Application for alterations and extensions including a balcony at 38 Parc Tyddyn Bach, Holyhead**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member due to concerns of the effect on residential amenity and the intrusion to privacy to neighbouring properties.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application is a retrospective application for the completion of a single-storey flat roof rear extension with a balcony situated above. The application site comprises a detached dwelling, with the nearest neighbouring properties at 60-66 Parc Tyddyn Bach. To mitigate any potential overlooking, the balcony will be enclosed with 1.8m high obscure glazed screening between the neighbouring property and the house provides a screen towards number 37 Parc Tyddyn Bach. Separation distances to the properties at the rear of the dwelling are 13m to the boundary and 25m from the dwelling. These separation distances comply with indicative separation distance of 7.5m to boundary and 9m to 15m to the property. It is accepted that there will be some overlooking due to the topography of the site, it is not considered to exceed that which might reasonably be expected from a typical first floor window in a two-storey dwelling. Additional screening is provided by an existing boundary fencing, along with a detached garage which help to screen the development from the neighbouring property. The recommendation was of approval of the application.

Councillor Glyn Haynes, a Local Member said that he 'call-in' the application to the Committee due concerns by neighbours at the rear of the 38 Parc Tyddyn Bach due to overlooking from the balcony. He said that he would be abstaining from voting on the application.

Councillor Neville Evans proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Geraint Bebb seconded the proposal of approval.

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

**12.5 HHP/2025/7 – Application for alterations and extensions together with the erection of a balcony at 39 Parc Tyddyn Bach, Holyhead**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member due to concerns of the effect on residential amenity and the intrusion to privacy to neighbouring properties.

Councillor Glyn Haynes, and a Local Member requested a site visit to the site due to the effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Councillor Trefor LI Hughes MBE proposed that a site visit be conducted, and Councillor Jackie Lewis seconded the proposal.

**It was RESOLVED that a site visit be undertaken in accordance with a Local Member's request.**

**12.6 VAR/2025/10 – Application under Section 73 for the variation of condition (03) (opening hours) of planning permission reference VAR/2020/50 (extension of opening hours from planning application 28C342A) so as to allow extended outside opening hours on the front terrace from 6pm to 9pm at Mojo's, 7 Marine Terrace, High Street, Rhosneigr**

*(Councillor Douglas Fowlie (as a Local Member) declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of application 12.6 and left the meeting following his representation as Local Member to the Committee).*

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

***Public Speakers***

Mrs Erin Rugg, **objecting the proposal**, said that she and her family are full-time, year-round residents of 5 Marine Terrace in Rhosneigr as are residents of Arfon House and 3 Tides Reach who have agreed to be included in her presentation to the Committee. She thanked the Council and the Planning Committee for creating a policy led, structured process and forum to evaluate planning requests such as this. It is important to lead with some data about the demographic of terrace as it is relevant to the points regarding policy and impact. Marine Terrace in Rhosneigr is a unique set of terraced houses as the majority of the properties are either full time owner occupied, or long-term lease occupied. This is very unusual as it is situated in an area that has a high



second home and holiday homes concentration. The terrace has eight houses, seven of which are occupied by year-round by full time residents; three of the eight houses have families with children, a majority of which are under the age of six. Within the terrace, three of houses have commercial businesses (Fat Face, Mojos, and Café Notos) on the ground floor. The neighbouring properties of Arfon House and Tides Reach also have year-round full-time residents living in them. The Anglesey & Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan provides the policy and guidance for evaluating requests such as this proposal. Planning Policy PCYFF 2 : DEVELOPMENT CRITERIA within section 6.2.4, refers 'planning permission will be refused where the proposed development would have an unacceptable adverse impact on: The health, safety or amenity of occupiers of local residences, other land and property uses or characteristics of the locality due to increased activity, disturbance, vibration, noise, dust, fumes, litter, drainage, light pollution, or other forms of pollution or nuisance.' Allowing for the outside dining hours to be extended until 9 PM will be detrimental to the quiet enjoyment of the full-time residents of Marine Terrace and neighbouring properties, especially during the busy summer season, school holidays, and Christmas period. The owner of 7 Marine Terrace has cited in their application that a canvas awning has been installed to help with the noise pollution. This awning is ineffective as all it does is deflect the noise down the terrace. Additionally, due to the windy weather in Rhosneigr, the awning is not able to be used in a consistent way. 7 Marine Terrace does not have the proper noise suppression materials installed in the interior and exterior of the property. Due to this, the terrace can often hear both the patrons of the business and music being played. The noise becomes more prevalent and a nuisance in the summer months when the front and back doors to 7 Marine Terrace are propped open for ventilation. Mojos is a licensed establishment – the combination of outside dining and the consumption of alcoholic beverages will increase the noise pollution and anti-social behaviour to the neighbours. Additionally, as there is not a designated smoking area, the attached and adjacent homes often suffer from smoke smells when the windows are open. This is likely to increase with the additional proposed outside hours. She referred to Light Pollution: Outside dining requires light. The existing light scheme shines into the first-floor bedrooms making it very difficult to sleep at night. Litter: The current Mojo's bin store can barely cope with the current trade and there is no room to expand the store. Adding 21 additional trading hours will create an environmental challenge with refuse not fitting into the current bins. Residents will be adversely impacted by the increased noise, litter, light pollution and nuisance by the proposed.

Ms Ellie Smith, **in support of the application**, said that she was representing the manager, licensee and resident living above Mojo's. She noted that the proposal is to reinstate a terrace operating hours from 6pm to 9pm. This request aligns with the National Planning Policy Framework, which encourages flexibility in supporting tourism and hospitality in suitable locations and complies with the Development Plan's goal of supporting rural economies; no physical development is proposed, just a slight extension of existing hours. Like all businesses, Mojo's faces rising costs with raw materials, energy, the recent increase to the minimum wage, and employer national insurance. This

modest extension helps cater to more customers and increases chances of remaining viable. It also means that the business can continue to employ 22 local staff and stay open year-round, something no other eating establishment in the village currently affords. When the business was taken over the terrace was tired and unattractive and investment was made to upgrading it, improving the look of the High Street and increasing privacy from what was there before. Mojo's is not a bar or a late-night venue, Mojo's attracts diners, families, couples, visitors looking for a good meal and not a rowdy crowd. The proposed hours end at 9pm, which fall within early evening limits, ending well before night-time quiet hours begin. The sun goes down on the side of the road around 6pm daily and so the extended hours would only be used on a handful of days throughout the summer and would be used only when the restaurant itself is too hot to sit inside. Rhosneigr's economy is seasonal, this small change would help capture a bit more summer trade and realistically, the terrace would not be used in the evenings for 9 months of the year. If Mojo's was converted back to its' former self as a terraced house, friends could be entertained on the terrace until 11pm. It is acknowledged the concerns raised by neighbours and she wanted to make it clear that these concerns are taken seriously. It is understood that one neighbour feels that their living room is overlooked, whilst that concern had not been raised to directly with the Manager, she is willing to increase the fence height to protect their privacy. Regarding neighbourly relations, no complaints made directly from any of the neighbours regarding the use of the terrace. A noise complaint has however recently been submitted to the Council and on reflection they were told that there was lack of evidence to support the false allegations, and it is believed to have been submitted with intention of blocking the application. On meeting with the immediate next-door neighbours recently it is regrettable that we did not confiding in them personally before the application was submitted. We have however always responded respectfully and in good faith to any concerns raised in the first year of business regarding staff smoking outside and the bin area. The aim is to improve communication and build stronger relationships with neighbours, and procedures have been reviewed around refuse and smoking to ensure they do not become issues. The Manager lives above Mojo's with younger son who has just started at high school locally and so does not want any extra noise to effect or disturb him nor herself and so would also be very strict with adhering to the rules. This is a family-friendly, not an alcohol-led, environment and smoking nor vaping is allowed on the terrace, this is clearly signposted. There is no live music or amplified sound outside. Bookings for the terrace stop 2 hours before closing, to allow time to finish before curfew. The installation of noise monitoring equipment has been offered alongside the existing CCTV. With this proposal there will be no increase in covers and so no added traffic or parking pressure and staff are well trained in managing customer flow. This is a small, proportionate request with limited impact and real benefits to the local economy, the high street and us. It would also support local employment and suppliers and brings us in line with the character and rhythm of the High Street. Local produce is sourced when possible and supporting other neighbouring businesses and those further afield on the Island. Regarding the high street, every other comparable venue in the village has outdoor evening seating. Mojo's would become the only hospitality business without evening

outside use. It becomes hard to explain to customers, especially in the summer when the area is alive and well-lit until late why they cannot have dinner outside. Visitors expect the village to offer dining options in line with the character of a vibrant seaside destination. We are not asking for late-night hours or a major expansion, just three more hours in line with our neighbouring businesses. We believe this is a fair compromise, as mentioned other businesses on the High Street already operate outdoor terraces much later, and some host live music until the early hours, but Mojo's is held to a stricter condition than others, this application simply asks for fair treatment.

The Planning Development Manager reported that Mojo's is a restaurant, creperie and bar, located on Marine Terrace in Rhosneigr. Whilst the application site is close to the commercial core of the settlement, this is a mixed-use area consisting of several residential properties, interspersed with retail and food outlets. An application was approved in April 2007 for the change of use of the creperie/bakery into a mixed use of creperie/bakery and café/restaurant. Condition (04) of this permission stated that no customers shall be permitted to make use of the front yard after 6.00 pm. An additional application was submitted to extend the use of the external terrace until 10.00 p.m, but this was refused as it was considered that the proposed new opening hours on the outside terrace area would harm the amenities of the nearby properties. Application reference VAR/2020/50 allowed the temporary use of the external area until 9.00 p.m., as temporary measure during the COVID restrictions, but the hours were reverted to 6.00 pm from January 2023 onwards. More recently, application reference VAR/2023/38 proposed to extend the outdoor opening hours to 9 pm, however the application was refused in August 2023 as the proposal impact on the privacy and amenity of immediate residential properties contrary to planning policy PCYFF 2. The site and surrounding area have not changed since the previously refused application such that the application is still considered contrary to policy PCYFF 2. It is acknowledged that there are several other food and drink establishments in the vicinity with different operating hours, however, the application site is in a more sensitive mid-terrace location with a residential property immediately next door. Café Notos is also located in a mid-terrace position at 4 Marine Terrace, which has also restricted outdoor area to 6.00 pm. Other food and drink establishments in the vicinity have different setups and are not mid-terrace or immediately adjacent to living room windows. Sandymount is a detached building with outdoor seating restricted to 10.00 pm since March 2018. Starvation is an end of terrace property set further in front of its adjacent properties, with no planning conditions restricting hours as planning approval was granted in 1989. Similarly, despite being a semi-detached public house with an external area close to the neighbouring property, Y Morfa was granted permission in 2004 such that there is no condition restricting opening hours. He further noted that the proposal to extend the outside opening hours from 6.00 pm to 9.00 pm is considered to have a detrimental impact upon the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings, with reference to noise and disturbance. Up to 18 customers could use the external seating area at Mojo's and would be situated close to the front window of the neighbouring terraced property. The recommendation was of refusal of the application.

Councillor Douglas M Fowlie, a Local Member said that 71 letters supporting the application and 7 letters in objection have been received as regards to this application. He noted that he 'called in' the application to allow both parties in support and against the application to have the opportunity to address the Committee. He referred to the parties that objected to the application who have referred to planning policy PCYFF 2 as it would have a negative impact on the neighbouring properties as the site of Mojo's is located within a terrace. Councillor Fowlie referred to the letters of support of the application; he noted that the Mojo's restaurant was previously a newsagent and thereafter it was an off-licence which operated until after 9.00 pm. He noted that concerns have been raised in the village that there are other commercial businesses with different opening hours; opposite Mojo's is a restaurant which has outdoor seating area until 11.00 pm and a fish and chip shop which is open until 8.00 pm with no 'dining in' facility which results in people queuing outside. He further referred to the Tea Caddy, a commercial premises, which received planning permission for a 10 bedroomed provision and 2 residential flats with a restaurant for 40 outside dining until 9.00 pm. Planning policy PCYFF 2 was not a material consideration as regards to the application even though there were concerns as to the overlooking into the neighbouring property.

Councillor Fowlie further referred to other commercial properties on the High Street of Rhosneigr who have different permission for outside dining areas, and he questioned whether it was fair that some premises had to close outside dining at 6.00 pm and other premises allowed to open 9.00 pm. He noted that if Mojo's was to be converted into a holiday let there would be no restrictions for barbecues to be held on the front terrace.

The Planning Development Manager responded that each application must be considered on its own merit. He explained that applications in the Rhosneigr High Street have been assessed as regards to planning policy PCYFF 2 and the impact on neighbouring properties are different.

Councillor Robin Williams said that he appreciated that businesses were offering opening for outside dining but as the Mojo's restaurant was in a terrace with residential dwelling next door this can lead to negative impact on the residents. He appreciated that there are numerous businesses in Rhosneigr with different planning permissions to allow outside dining at different closing hours and Café Notos at the other end of the terrace has restricted outside dining until 6.00 pm. Councillor Williams proposed that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Neville Evans, and a Local Member said that whilst Rhosneigr is a vibrant community for visitors it must be considered that Rhosneigr is a village with dwellings in a residential area. He noted that the Llanfaelog Community Council has expressed concern as to the variation of the outside dining hours from 6.00 pm to 9.00 pm. Councillor Evans seconded the proposal of refusal.

Councillor John Ifan Jones referred to planning application VAR/2025/3 in the village of Newborough which was approved for outside dining until 9.00 pm

and is located in a terrace of residential dwellings. He noted that parking and traffic has been raised as regards to this application, but the similar situation exists in Newborough. There are numerous businesses on the High Street in Rhosneigr and this is a vibrant location with visitors visiting the area. Councillor John Ifan Jones proposed that the application be approved as there is a need to be consistent with other businesses allowed to open for outside dining until 9.00 pm. Councillor Glyn Haynes seconded the proposal of approval.

The Planning Development Manager said that he agreed that businesses should be supported but residential amenities need to be considered. He referred to the planning approval of the Café in Newborough which had a temporary permission for two years to assess the impact on neighbouring properties due to noise nuisance. However, there were no issues of concern raised by the neighbouring properties and an additional application was submitted in January, 2025 and was approved through the delegation process. The outside seating area in Newborough is for 8 persons whilst this application is for the provision of 18 persons which is outside the neighbouring property's front window.

Following the vote of 7 for refusing the application and 2 for approval.

**It was RESOLVED to refuse the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.**

**12.7 FPL/2024/360 – Full application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and the erection of a replacement dwelling together with alterations to the existing access, the installation of a sewage treatment plant and associated works at Ty Coch Farm, Rhostrehwfa**

*(Councillor John Ifan Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of application 12.7 and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon).*

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member and as the Council is responsible for the access track that leads from the B4422 to the site.

***Public Speaker***

Mrs Non Gibson, the applicant and **in support of the application**, said that it is their intention to bring a long-term empty property at Ty Côch back into use by creating a sustainable home. There is a house and four sheds on the site – the fourth shed was demolished by the Council prior to the sale of the property for safety reasons due to its condition. It is also an intend to demolish two sheds and the house that dates back to the same period. The shed to the left on the way into the site will be kept – which is an original stone shed with a metal roof. The report states that the house has no architectural or historic value. The back wall is “bulging”, and the wooden floors have rotten away and fallen into the ground. The rooms are small, dark and damp and its layout is

impractical. The applicant's Architects have prepared the usual reports but this time a local company was employed to look over them. Unfortunately, their feedback was received too late to be able to respond before the reports for today's committee were completed. The company notes that the new build compared to restoration comparison costs are low compared to the figures of the BCIS. Whilst disagreeing, and following their advice and increasing both figures, the report's conclusions would be the same, namely that a new build is more economical. The cost of a new build will be lower than the figures of the BCIS as most of the work will be done by using our own machinery and recycled materials and every penny will be invested in the local economy by supporting local companies and craftsmen from Anglesey. Restoring a structure that is over a hundred years old is specialist and complicated work. Using "set rates" to price the cost is unsuitable as each case is so different. It is uncertain what issues will crop up when the shell of the house is removed and so it is impossible to calculate the restoration costs. Rebuilding walls and underpinning vulnerable stone walls is specialist and costly work, the health and safety risks are also substantial. The long-term economic implications for both options have not been considered either, in terms of energy use the modern home would be much more efficient. If restoring the old house was a viable option, why did the Council not restore it rather than sell it. To ensure the house integrates into the local area, the house's finishing materials will be in keeping with the original shed and the old stones from the site will be reused and the demolished buildings. The roof will be clad in dark metal, which, in terms of its colour, will look like slate, and part of the roof will be fitted with a "Solar Standing Seam" that will look like the rest of the roof but will generate electricity. Due to its simple shape and native materials, the house will integrate with its natural surroundings and the dark colours on the first floor will ensure the house camouflages with the mature trees surrounding it. There are two houses nearby where single storey cottages once stood, Bryn Gwenith and Tŷ Llwyd, that are nearly a third larger than what is proposed. Both houses are on the ridge in Rhostrehwfa and can be seen from several viewpoints. There is a house and outbuildings at Tŷ Coch and they are nestled below the ridge. The site is also hidden by mature trees. As a family, they are asking for a simple four-bedroom house measuring 399.5m<sup>2</sup> according to the architect's CAD. According to the report, the house will be 9m longer and 5m wider than the existing house; this a reasonable size considering the age of the house, its secluded location and the fact that four buildings will be replaced by one. The total build is much less and if it were an application for an extension, it would be considered acceptable (like the recent extension at Hen Barc Glas, Bodorgan). A larger build and a much more intrusive visual impact but an application that would be approved, so why is it so difficult to build a new home for a local family. Nant Turnpike road to Llangefni is a thousand meters away (1km) and due to its incline, it is almost impossible to see Tŷ Coch. From this distance, it is impossible to differentiate between the house and sheds and the new house will be an improvement as the building mass will be less. There have been four consultations to date – there has been no response from the public or the Community Council only a positive response from the Highways Department and Public Footpaths Officer. Point 4, page 64 states "*the scheme would have no negative impacts on nearby residential properties*". She quoted from the policy, an extract often quoted at appeals

*“...a larger well-designed dwelling that does not lead to significantly greater visual impact could be supported”* and the evidence confirms that there will be no impact. She further said that the proposed dwelling will be smaller in size to the previous application.

The Planning Development Manager reported on the main considerations of the application and said that this is the third application for a replacement dwelling on site after application reference FPL/2023/47 was withdrawn in May 2023 and application reference FPL/2023/227 was refused by this Committee in February, 2024 mainly to increase floor area of the replacement dwelling by approximately 295% compared to the existing farmhouse. The main criterion for assessing this application is criterion 4 and 7 of planning policy TAI 13. Criterion 4 states that developments outside development boundaries that are not capable of retention through renovation and extension and/or it is demonstrated that the repair of the existing building is not economically feasible. Paragraph 6.4.82 of the Joint Local Development Plan states that preference will be given towards the renovation of buildings with new build only being permitted when it is unviable to undertake such renovation work. The ‘Replacement Dwellings and Conversions in the Countryside’ within section 13.1 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance states that a structural report should be submitted with the application that notes the suitability of the building for reuse. Any structural report should be supported by a financial viability report detailing the cost of undertaking the restoration/adaptation of the building compared to the costs associated with the demolition and replacement. A house that requires modernisation is not eligible to be considered for demolition and replacement. Any viability assessment should include costs associated with repairing an identified problem and should not include costs of work that relates to the applicant’s aspiration. A structural report and build cost comparison has been submitted in support of the application and have been scrutinized by a qualified Chartered Surveyor. In terms of the new build costs, the cost per square metre noted in the cost comparison is lower than the average cost for a detached new build taken from the BCIS. When considering a house of the size being proposed, the costs would be expected to be at the upper end of any cost range as houses of that size have a higher-than-average specification and a greater number of bathrooms, suggesting that the costs of a new build dwelling on site have been deflated. The same method was utilised for the renovation costs, which sat below the median rate, but the Chartered Surveyor expected these costs to be higher as the applicants contend that the dwelling is structurally compromised but the cost comparison does not explicitly refer to remediation of the defects noted. The structural report notes that there are structural issues and issues with damp and dry rot at the property, with the photographs showing a property in need of renovation. However, there is no explanation on possible causes for the issues, whether they are ongoing or historic and there is no indication of how to remedy the issues expect for demolishing the farmhouse. The structural report concludes by noting that it would be more practical and economical to demolish the dwelling and erect a replacement, however the structural report makes no reference to the costs of any potential renovation and structural remediation. There appears to be no relationship between the structural

report and the build cost comparison. The structural report should make recommendations, and the cost comparison should provide the costs of carrying out the recommendations. The build cost comparison for a new build and renovation are both low when compared to BCIS average rates. The structural report does show a property requiring significant renovation, with a conclusion that it would be more practical and economical to demolish and rebuild the property, but there is no explanation on how this conclusion has been arrived upon and no details on the assessment of costs made to arrive at this conclusion. It is considered that insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the existing dwelling is not capable of retention through renovation and extension, and it has not been demonstrated that the repair of the existing building is not economically feasible. The proposal is therefore contrary to Criteria 4 of planning policy TAI 13.

Criteria 7 of planning policy TAI 13 states that developments outside the development boundaries, refers that the siting and design of the total new development should be of a similar scale and size and should not create a visual impact significantly greater than the existing dwelling in order that it can be satisfactory absorbed or integrated into the landscape. In exceptional circumstances a larger well-designed dwelling that does not lead to significant greater visual impact could be supported. This is echoed by paragraph 14.2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance which states that original floor area should be considered when considering if the developments scale is similar to the original. When justification has been received that would mean that the floor area would need to be larger than the original building, it is considered that this addition should be no larger than 20% of the floor area of the original unit. It is noted that this figure is a guide and not a target and every application will be assessed individually on its merit. It should be ensured that the addition in the floor area is essential in terms of practicality and should not be part of an aspiration for a larger house. No outbuilding should be considered when calculating the floor area of the residential unit and nearby buildings that are larger in size is not a reasonable justification to increase the size of the residential unit that is subject to replacement. The existing dwelling has a total floor area of approximately 152.9m<sup>2</sup>, which is proposed to be increased to around 456.6m<sup>2</sup> as part of this development. This is a 198.6% increase in the floor area, which is almost ten times greater than the 20% guidance noted in the Supplementary Planning Guidance. The replacement dwelling would also constitute considerable increase in length, width and height compared to the existing dwelling. These figures demonstrate the substantial proposed increase in scale and massing of the dwelling, which is in no way similar to scale and size to the existing dwelling. There is no justification received for such a significant increase in floor area, which is considered aspiration rather than essential. Furthermore, the outbuilding proposed for demolition cannot be considered as part of the floor area. Whilst the applicant's agent has submitted examples of recent replacement dwellings from elsewhere, each application is considered on its own merits and nearby buildings that are larger in size is not a reasonable justification to increase the size of the residential unit that is subject to replacement. The replacement dwelling would be substantially larger than the existing dwelling with a notably greater footprint and would fail to comply with criteria 7 of the policy. The



recommendation is of refusal of the application as it is contrary to criteria 4 and 7 of planning policy TAI 13.

Councillor Nicola Roberts, a Local Member said that this application has been submitted by a local family who wish to build a dwelling to meet their needs and to live locally in their community. Ty Coch is an old farmhouse which is inadequate for modern living and the house has structural issues. The family has worked with the Planning Officers and local Architects to try and build a dwelling that is fit for purpose and that protects the site. However, the Planning Authority are still recommending refusal of the application even though there has been no local objection, and the previous application was for a dwelling that was 295% larger than this application which is 198% larger than the original dwelling. She referred to an application that was 420% larger than the original dwelling and was approved by appeal. Councillor Roberts said that this application can be approved as it could be accepted as an exception as it is not a Listed Building. She further said that there are different large design dwellings in the vicinity and much larger than this application. The proposal will be landscaped by the original trees and hedges and will mitigate the visual impact on the landscape. The structural reports highlight the condition of the current dwelling. Councillor Roberts asked the Committee to support the application for an adequate home for a local family.

The Planning Development Manager reported that he has provided training for Members on the appeal process and building larger dwellings which the Planning Inspectorate has approved. The structural report has been assessed under Criterion 4 of planning policy TAI 13 by an external Chartered Surveyor and there is no justification for a new dwelling as the cost comparison does not explicitly refer to remediation of the defects noted in the current dwelling. He noted that whilst the dwelling will not be visible from the highway this does not constitute that the planning policies are not relevant.

Councillor Geraint Bebb, and a Local Member said that this is an application by a local family and the current dwelling on the site is not adequate for renovation in its current state for modern living. He considered that the new dwelling would fit in well into its location. Councillor Bebb proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Robin Williams questioned whether the existing dwelling was sufficient in size for the needs of the applicants. He noted that the new proposed dwelling would be on the footprint of the existing dwelling and one of the outbuildings and he did not understand as to why the Planning Officer's objected that the footprint of outbuildings should not be part of the plans. The proposed new dwelling is significantly smaller in size than the previous application. Councillor Williams seconded the proposal of approval.

The Planning Development Manager said that when a building needs to be demolished and if there are outbuildings on the site the planning policy states that the building should be built on the existing footprint of the dwelling which is a valid planning reason.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts said that generally he supported that demolition of dwelling which has no architectural value, but the financial viability must be made as regards to the costs of renovating the current dwelling and building a new building. Councillor Roberts 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.**

***(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 reasons given for approving the application.)***

**13 OTHER MATTERS**

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

**COUNCILLOR KEN TAYLOR  
CHAIR**