

Planning and Orders Committee

Minutes of the hybrid meeting held on 3 December 2025

- PRESENT:** Councillor Ken Taylor (Chair)
Councillor Glyn Haynes (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors Geraint Bebb, Neville Evans, Kenneth Hughes,
John Ifan Jones, Robert LI Jones, Euryrn Morris and Robin Williams
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Planning Development Manager,
Group Engineer (Development Control) & Traffic Management
(AR),
Legal Advisor (BS),
Senior Planning Officer (SOH),
Planning Assistant (CMT),
Committee Officer (MEH),
Webcasting Committee Services Officer (FT).
- APOLOGIES:** Councillors Jackie Lewis and Dafydd Roberts
- ALSO PRESENT:** Councillor Carwyn Jones (for application 12.2)

The Chair referred to the sad loss of Councillor Trefor LI Hughes MBE who passed away recently following illness. The Chair expressed his deepest sympathy with Mrs Janet Hughes, Councillor Hughes' wife and family. The Committee Members and Officers stood in silent tribute.

1 APOLOGIES

As noted above.

2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

None received.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 5 November, 2025 were confirmed as correct.

4 SITE VISITS

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

5 PUBLIC SPEAKING

There were Public Speakers in respect of applications 12.1 and 12.2.

6 APPLICATIONS THAT WILL BE DEFERRED

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

7 APPLICATIONS ARISING

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

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 FPL/2025/240 – Ful application for the change of use of a dwelling (Use Class C3) into a dentist and health clinic (Use Class D1) at 32 High Street, Menai Bridge

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

The Planning Development Manager reported that the property is located within the development boundary of Menai Bridge and the town centre boundary but is not within the Primary Retail Area of the Local Service Centre of Menai Bridge as defined in the Joint Local Development Plan. The application site is also within the designated Conservation Area. Strategic Policy PS 15 of the Joint Local Development Plan seeks to protect and enhance the vitality and viability of town centres and their retail, service and social functions. A diverse mix of suitable uses is encouraged within high quality urban centres and attracts a wide range of people at different times of the day. It is considered that a Dentist and Health Clinic complies with policy MAN 1 as is noted within the Officer's report. The types of town centre use (B1, D1 and D2) will be encouraged to locate within identified town centres, but outside the identified Primary Retail Areas. The Highways Department have been consulted on the proposal and have raised no objection due to the sustainable location of the proposal and availability of public car parks nearby. It is

considered that the application is acceptable and accords with relevant development plan policies. The recommendation was of approval of the application.

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

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

12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS

12.1 HHP/2025/93 – Full application for the construction of a vehicular access together with creating a parking area at Smyrna Chapel, Glanhwfa Road, Llangefni

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member due to local concerns and highway safety.

Public Speaker

Mr Ynys Berry, **in support of his application**, said that he and his brother are the owners and developers of Capel Smyrna. He said that both have been raised here in Anglesey and have returned to the area after several years abroad. Approval is request for a dropped kerb to enable a driveway alongside the Ysgoldy at Capel Smyrna. Significant time, investment and resources have been undertaken into bringing these historic buildings back into meaningful use, with the intention of enhancing the local area, preserving cultural character, and contributing positively to the housing supply within Llangefni. The intentions align with the strategic vision set out in the adopted Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan for Llangefni to have a “retained and strengthened role as a town providing homes, jobs and community facilities”. The site forms part of a wider heritage-led regeneration project at Capel Smyrna. Stage 1 of the development will deliver the residential conversion of the Ysgoldy. Stage 2 will aim to deliver mixed-used development of a Co-Working Space and Youth Services, which will meet several strategic policies set out in Joint Local Development Plan. Stage 2 cannot proceed without first refurbishing the Ysgoldy. The dropped kerb is essential for several reasons: -

1. It provides safe and practical access to off-street parking. The Ynys Mon Local Plan requires that “Proposals for development will be expected to incorporate adequate and appropriate amounts of onsite parking”. National Policy adopts the principle of maximum parking standards as a means of promoting sustainable development. The standard for a 2-bedroom dwelling is 1.5 to 2 spaces per unit. Furthermore, the golden rule priorities “quality of the street above all else” and aims to “maximise the activity between the street and the house for safer, friendlier streets”.

2. It enables the refurbishment of the Ysgoldy; it has been assessed that this is to be the safest approach to construction. Written confirmation has been sought that

alternatives (on-street manoeuvring or use of Council car parks across the road) are assessed by Highways as safer for construction traffic, site workers, and residents.

3. It reduces on-street parking pressure by providing dedicated off-street parking, the burden on the immediate neighbourhood will be reduced rather than increased. This is not only beneficial to residents but also aligns with the Council's aims of improving parking provision and reducing congestion.

4. It supports the viability and longevity of a heritage redevelopment in line with Policy PS 20 and enables "opportunities to re-use suitable buildings" within the town centre as per Strategic Policy PS15. This project preserves a Grade II listed locally significant historic building. For the scheme to be functional and sustainable for future residents, appropriate access is essential. The lack of a dropped kerb would compromise the usability of the site and create unnecessary barriers to completing a high-quality redevelopment that contributes to Llangefni's regeneration goals. Local concerns have been considered, and it is believed that the application addresses these concerns. It is appreciated that the driveway joins a priority system which is the basis of concerns. It is important to keep in mind that a road is also meant to be in service of the buildings. To give historical context, the land was originally used for access when built, substantiated by chapel records and archival research. List Building Consent has been approved. The modern roadside parking in front of the Chapel was lost with the development of the priority system in 2011. The last congregation at Capel Smyrna was in 2017. It was emphasised that the proposed location, visibility splays, and pavement design meet the policy standards. This application was made in March, and it is now 9 months on. The delays that have been encountered in progressing this simple and straightforward element of the scheme have not reflected the supportive approach that the Council publicly advocates. The longer these delays continue, the more difficult it becomes to maintain momentum on projects that are intended to benefit the town. We bear the costs of services, insurance, maintenance, rising construction costs, and of course our personal rent. We have also been unable to commit to our builders, a local firm based in Llangefni, and will have to return to tender. A smooth, timely, and collaborative planning process is crucial if we want to see sites like this restored and brought back into meaningful use, rather than falling further into disrepair or being subject to vandalism and arson.

The Planning Development Manager reported that planning approval was granted in November 2024 for the change of use of the Schoolhouse at Capel Smyrna, Glanhwfa Road, Llangefni into a dwelling and office. The application did not include parking spaces provision, and the Highways Authority raised no objection considering its existing use (i.e. D1) and its sustainable location in the centre of Llangefni. The Members were afforded images of the location site at the meeting as the main consideration of this application is highway safety. The Highways Authority has considered the proposal in terms of Highway Safety. The Highways Authority was initially supportive of the application, however, after further consideration and consultation with the Local Planning Authority, the Highways Authority has confirmed that they object to the construction of a new vehicular access due to safety concerns. The proposed access would be directly onto the Class A highway, which forms one of the principal approaches into Llangefni from the South (i.e. under the former Railway bridge). The highway in front of Capel Smyrna carries a high volume of traffic, service and delivery vehicles, and functions

as a key distributor within the local highway network. The highway narrows within proximity of the proposed access, and this would pose a substantial risk of conflict with through-traffic. Vehicles attempting to enter or exit the site would be doing so at a location where road users are already required to negotiate priority movements. This would undermine the safe and free flow of traffic along this strategic route. The proposed development does not have sufficient space within the site to accommodate manoeuvring; this would result in cars not being able to enter and exit in a forward gear. If cars were to reverse onto the highway this would restrict visibility and be detrimental to pedestrians and highway safety. This would be a fundamental requirement, particularly on classified roads such as this section of Glanhwfa Road. Vehicles approaching from the North (town centre direction) would need to reverse into the car parking area to avoid reversing out; reversing into a narrow access from a heavily trafficked A class road would be impractical and unsafe. It is foreseen that vehicles would enter the car parking spaces in a forward gear and would result in vehicles reversing onto the highway. The Highways Authority notes that all other properties along this section of Glanhwfa Road are served by accesses which provide turning facilities, ensuring that vehicles can egress in a forward gear. The creation of a new access without such provision would be inconsistent with the established standard and would be detrimental to highway safety. The recommendation was of refusal of the application.

Councillor Geraint Bebb, and a Local Member said that several accidents have occurred near this site and vehicles entering the town tend to speed to avoid traffic leaving the town. Councillor Bebb proposed that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Kenneth P Hughes said that the access to the site is narrow, and vehicles would be unable to turn around within the site, and the only solution would be to create a turntable. Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal of refusal.

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

12.2 HHP/2025/151 – Full application for the erection of a balcony together with the erection of a garage at Ty Hen Efail, Llanddona

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

Councillor Carwyn Jones, a Local Member said that he and his fellow Local Member, Councillor Alun Roberts said that it would be beneficial for the Committee to conduct a site visit to the application site. He said that the proposal for the erection of a balcony would overlook directly into the neighbouring property, causing privacy concerns.

The Planning Development Manager said that he intended to show images of the site to the meeting, however, due to the distance of 36 meters away from the neighbouring property, this is double the required distance stipulated within the Supplementary Guidance (SPG).

Councillor Euryr Morris said that whilst the stipulated distance is double from the neighbouring property he considered that it would be better to view the images as suggested by the Officer rather than conducting a site visit. Councillor Morris proposed not to conduct a site visit. Councillor Glyn Haynes seconded the proposal.

Councillor John Ifan Jones said that to have a clear view of such a balcony on a property would be to have a site visit. Councillor Robin Williams seconded the proposal of a site visit to the site.

Following the vote, of 4 in favour of conducting a site visit and 4 against, the casting vote of the Chair was not to conduct a site visit.

Public Speaker

Mrs Debbie Oulton, **objecting to the proposal**, said that she and her husband live at Crosswinds, Llanddona directly opposite Ty Hen Efail. The site plan in the Planning Officer's report and the Location Plan 19092025 show the orientation of Ty Hen Efail. The proposed balcony will be on the southern elevation, not the eastern elevation as stated in the planning officer's report. The location is also shown on the "Proposed Plans 19092025" as "Side Elevation" and is the southern elevation. She said that they would have no objection to a balcony sited on the eastern elevation. She disagreed with the Planning Officer's conclusion that the "proposal is not considered to have a negative impact on the amenity of adjacent residential properties". The proposed balcony on the upper storey of Ty Hen Efail would directly overlook the bedroom, living room and front garden at Crosswinds, giving no privacy in any rooms at the front of our property. Whilst the distances may be compliant with the SPG, the effect of being overlooked is compounded by the fact that Ty Hen Efail sits on a more elevated location than Crosswinds, and the balcony would be sited on the upper storey of this tall property. There is a seven-foot-high hedge along part of our boundary; however, the upper windows of Ty Hen Efail are clearly visible even over this hedge and allow a view directly into our living room and bedroom. This cannot be considered as "effective screening" since the balcony would look over the top of the hedge, and there is a wide gap in the hedge to allow vehicle access from the road. If the balcony is approved, our privacy could be affected whenever we enter or leave our home, when we go into the front garden and every time, we open our living room or bedroom curtains. Photos were attached to the original comment on the Planning Portal which show that a balcony would be completely visible from our entrance and our bedroom, with no effective screening whatsoever. The Planning Officer also took photos from our bedroom window when he visited us at our request. With regards to Japanese Knotweed, we are pleased to see that there is an updated management plan including removal of the plant. We did not see mention that the area of Japanese Knotweed marked as JK2 is adjacent to the watercourse. We wish to be assured that any additional biosecurity measures needed to prevent any plant materials from entering the

watercourse, will be included in a revised plan (if this has not already been considered). We feel privileged to live in Llanddona and have worked hard to become part of the community, joining the Neuadd Bentref Village Hall Committee, volunteering at the Hall, Caffi Ni and learning to speak Welsh. This is not just our retirement home, but a whole new way of life for us. Being so overlooked would greatly affect our privacy and make us feel uncomfortable in our own home. The Planning Officer has recommended approval of both plans, but we would ask the committee to take a broader view of the possible impact on themselves and their property.

The Planning Development Manager said that the existing dwelling at Ty Hen Efail is a two-storey detached property located outside the development boundary of Llanddona, as defined in the Local Development Plan and is located near the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Committee were afforded images of the property of Ty Hen Efail from the objectors' property Crosswinds and from the application site. He further said that the proposal consists of erecting a first-floor balcony on the Eastern elevation of the existing dwelling and erecting a new garage at the front Eastern side of the site next to the existing access. It was noted that it is considered that there is no objection to the erection of a new garage. The balcony will measure 2.5 metres in height from the ground level and will extend 1.5 metres out from the first floor of the existing dwelling and will measure 4.8 metres in width. A set of indicative minimum distances to prevent overlooking issues as noted within the SPG. For a secondary-to-secondary windows (i.e. bedroom to bedroom) the guidance is between 9 metres and 15 metres depending on the location. The guidance stipulates a distance of 18 metres from a secondary to a principal window, bedroom to living room, and an addition 3 metres is added if there is a change in ground levels. The distance from the proposed balcony and the neighbouring property Crosswinds is 36 meters which is double the distance stipulated in the guidance and there is also a highway separating both properties with a high hedge in the neighbouring property acting as effective screening along their front boundary. Therefore, it is considered that due to the distances, the high hedge vegetation and the main road separating the dwellings it is considered that the application complies with planning policy PCYFF 2. The recommendation was to approve the application.

Councillor Carwyn Jones, a Local Member said that he was disappointed that the request of two Local Members for a site visit to the site had been rejected. The request for a site visit was based on local knowledge and the location of the site. He said that the Committee would have had an opportunity to view the site before considering the application. The proposed application will affect the amenities of the neighbouring property and especially their bedroom window and their garden when the proposed balcony is erected as it will be in an elevated position.

Councillor Euryr Morris accepted the comments of the Local Member, but he considered that the images shown of the proposal was sufficient to come to a decision as the application complies with the relevant planning policies. He considered that if the application was refused the applicant could appeal and be successful in appealing the decision.

Councillor Eurnyn Morris 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 contained within the report.

The following applications were considered together as they deal with the same application site, and the context is relevant to both applications.

12.3 LUE/2025/30 – Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for the existing use of operational development undertaken to implement planning permission 41LPA1041/FR/TR/CC on land to the east of Start Crossroads, Star

12.4 VAR/2025/42 – Application under Section 73 for the variation of condition (11) (CTMP) and condition (17) (Detailed Report on Archaeology Work) of planning permission reference 41LPA1041/FR/TR/CC (Creation of Gypsie and Traveller Site) so as to enable the CTMP to be submitted following the commencement of development and to enable the archaeology report to be submitted within a different timescale at Star Crossroads, Star

The applications were presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is made by the Local Authority on land owned by the Authority.

The Planning Development Manager reported that planning permission was approved in October, 2018 for the change of use of agricultural land to a temporary stopping place for 10 spaces for Gypsies and Travellers, formation of a new vehicular access, the formation of a new pedestrian access and pavement together with associated development on land east of Star Crossroads, Star. Condition (01) stated that a material of that consent, stated that a material start would be required to have been made before the 10 October, 2023, which is 5 years from the original permission. The planning statement notes that works on site commenced on the 18 February, 2020 and the Local Planning Authority do not have any evidence which contradicts this information. Works deemed as a material start is defined under Section 56(4) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and this definition includes any operation in the course of laying out of construction a road or part of a road, including access as is the case with this application. The evidence provided includes photographs of the new access along with confirmation that these works were included within those commence on the 18 February, 2020. The original consent included a number of conditions which required to be discharged prior to commencing works on the site. Conditions (04), (12), (14), (15) and (16) were discharged, however, it is noted that conditions (11) (Construction of traffic management plan) and (17) (Archaeology works report) were not discharged prior to commencing the works. The information provided was considered acceptable by the relevant consultees and it was additionally stated by the Legal Advisor that the conditions did not go to the heart of the consent, and it is considered that a Certificate of Lawfulness can be presented based on the work carried out.

The Planning Development Manager further reported that planning application 12.4 on the agenda, is for the variation of condition to allow the applicant to present a Construction Management Plan (condition 11) and the Archaeology Report (condition 17) after the work has commenced. The Traffic Management Plan was submitted by the application and consultation has been taken with the Highways Authority who have no objection; therefore, the condition can be varied. The application submission included the report specified by the conditions within the report and were assessed by Heneb. In response, it was noted that the archaeological work was completed satisfactorily, although little of interest was recorded on the site. The delayed submission in this case had no material impact on fulfilling the public interest in making the results available and as such Heneb were satisfied that the requested variation could be approved. The recommendation was to approve the application for a Certificate of Lawful Use and to approve the application for the variation of conditions placed on the original permission. To allow this information to be presented after the work has commenced on the site.

Councillor Robin Williams, and a Local Member said that he has been consistent in rejecting the applications on the site as he does not consider that the site is within a safe location for any encampment. The regulations regarding the definition of material start with putting hardcore and demolishing a wall is questionable as material start. He said that he would not be voting in favour of the applications and would abstain from voting.

Councillor Kenneth P Hughes proposed that applications 12.3 and 12.4 be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Euryyn Morris seconded the proposal of approval.

It was RESOLVED to approve applications 12.3 and 12.4 in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the planning conditions contained within the reports.

13 OTHER MATTERS

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

**COUNCILLOR KEN TAYLOR
CHAIR**