

# PLANNING AND ORDERS COMMITTEE

## Minutes of the meeting held on 2 October, 2013

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>PRESENT:</b>       | Councillor W.T.Hughes (Chair)<br>Councillor Ann Griffith (Vice-Chair)<br><br>Councillors Lewis Davies, Jeff Evans, John Griffith,<br>Kenneth Hughes, Vaughan Hughes, Victor Hughes,<br>Raymond Jones, Richard Owain Jones, Nicola Roberts.   |
| <b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b> | Chief Planning Officer (EGJ) (for item 7.3)<br>Planning Development Manager (DFJ)<br>Development Manager Team Leader (DPJ) (for item 7.3)<br>Planning Assistants<br>Senior Engineer (Development Control)<br>Legal Services Manager (RJ)<br>Committee Officer (ATH)  |
| <b>APOLOGIES:</b>     | None   |
| <b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>  | Local Members : Councillor R.Llewelyn Jones (application 7.3),<br>R.G.Parry, OBE (application 11.1) Dafydd Rhys Thomas<br>(application 12.6)<br><br>Councillor J.Arwel Roberts (Portfolio Member for Planning),<br>Richard Dew, Aled Morris Jones, G.O.Jones, Llinos M.Huws,<br>Alwyn Rowlands, Ieuan Williams |

---

### 1 APOLOGIES

There were no apologies for absence.

### 2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were made as follows –

Councillor W.T.Hughes in respect of application 7.2 (personal interest)

Councillor John Griffith in respect of application 7.3 (personal interest)

Councillor Victor Hughes in respect of application 13.1

Councillors Lewis Davies, Ann Griffith, John Griffith, Vaughan Hughes, and Nicola Roberts declared personal interests on account of the reference to wind turbines within the Plaid Cymru Manifesto but stated that they would consider each application on its own merits.

Councillor J.Arwel Roberts, Portfolio Member for Planning although not a Member of the Committee, declared a personal interest in respect of application 7.3

### 3 MINUTES OF THE 4<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2013 MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2013 were presented and confirmed as correct subject to the following amendments:

- In the Welsh version of the minutes, that Councillors Lewis Davies, Ann Griffith, John Griffith, Vaughan Hughes, and Nicola Roberts declared an interest on account of the reference to wind turbines within the Plaid Cymru Manifesto but stated that they would consider each application on its own merits.

- That it be noted that Councillor Ann Griffith abstained on the voting in respect of application 34C638A.

#### **4 SITE VISITS**

The minutes of the site visit held on 18<sup>th</sup> September, 2013 were presented and confirmed as correct.

#### **5 PUBLIC SPEAKING**

The Chair announced that there would be public speakers in relation to applications 7.3 and 12.6.

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

##### **6.1 30C713 – Erection of one 10kw wind turbine with a maximum hub height of up to 15.5m, rotor diameter of up to 7.5m and a maximum upright vertical tip height of up to 19.25m on land at Bryn Mair, Llanbedrgoch**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it has been decided that delegated powers will not be used in connection with wind turbine developments. The Officer's recommendation was that a site visit be undertaken.

**It was resolved that the site be visited in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.**

##### **6.2 35C553A – Outline application for residential development including extra care facility, highway and associated infrastructure at Ty'n Coed, Llangefni**

The application was a departure application that Officers were minded to approve.

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that in order to allow further consultations in respect of housing supply figures and education contribution to take place, the Officer's recommendation was one of deferral.

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

##### **6.3 39C385D – Full application for the erection of 17 dwellings on land at Lôn Gamfa, Menai Bridge**

The Planning Development Manager explained that the application site had been visited on 19<sup>th</sup> December and that in subsequent meetings of the Committee, consideration of the application was deferred for various reasons until it was eventually resolved to remove the application from the schedule until a recommendation is available. Due to the Committee's new membership following the local elections in May, an insufficient number of the Planning Committee's new membership will have visited the site to enable determination to be made. It is therefore deemed necessary for the site to be revisited. At the time of the report's writing, a formal consultation is also being sent to the newly elected Local Members for the area.

**It was resolved that the application site be re-visited in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.**

##### **6.4 44C294B – Full application for the erection of two 20kw wind turbines with a maximum hub height of 20.5m, a rotor diameter of 13.1m and a maximum vertical upright height of 27.1m on land at Plas Newydd, Rhosybol.**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it has been decided that delegated powers will not be used in connection with wind turbine developments. The Officer's recommendation is that the application site be visited.

**It was resolved to undertake a site visit in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.**

## 7 APPLICATIONS ARISING

### **7.1 22C211C – Full application for the erection of one wind turbine with a maximum hub height of 25m, a rotor diameter of 19.24m and a maximum vertical upright height of 34.37m on land at Yr Orsedd, Llanddona**

The application was reported to the Committee as it has been decided that delegated powers will not be used in connection with wind turbine developments.

The Planning Development Manager reminded the Committee's Members that consideration of the application was deferred at the previous meeting of the Committee at the request of the applicant to allow him to submit information in response to the Officer's reasons for recommending refusal of the application. The Officer said that hitherto no further information regarding the application had been received although he was aware that discussions are in the offing. The applicant has again requested a further deferral to submit additional information. However from an officer perspective there has been no material change in the situation and the recommendation remains one of refusal on the grounds outlined in the written report. It is open to the applicant should he so wish, to submit an application anew.

Councillor Jeff Evans said that he believed that sufficient time had been afforded the applicant to make available any additional information in respect of the application and he therefore proposed that the Officer's recommendation of refusal be accepted. Councillor Nicola Roberts seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lewis Davies as a Local Member said that he sympathised with the applicant who makes his living as a milk farmer and who is seeking to take advantage of Government renewable energy policies and he said that he had no objection to a wind turbine in the farmyard for the purpose of the business. However, he could not support the application as presented and he felt that he had to be consistent in his stance since he had previously opposed the erection of an anemometer in a greenfield site. He objected to this application for the reasons of its effects on the area given there are already two other masts in the area; its effects on natural systems and in migrating birds; its effects on the landscape which borders an AONB; its effects on tourism; its effects on Police radio communications and because the community council also objects to the proposal.

**It was resolved to refuse the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.**  
*(Councillor Vaughan Hughes did not vote on the application as he had not been present on the site visit)*

### **7.2 38C219C – Full application for the erection of one 10kw wind turbine with a maximum hub height of 15m, a rotor diameter of 9.7m and a maximum vertical upright height of 19.5m on land at Cae Mawr, Llanfechell**

The application was reported to the Committee as it has been decided that delegated powers will not be used in connection with wind turbine developments.

*Councillor W.T.Hughes had declared a personal but not prejudicial interest in this application and remained in the meeting throughout the discussion and took part in the voting on the application.*

The Planning Development Manager reminded Members that they had visited the site following a resolution to do so at the meeting of the Committee in September. He referred to the written report which set out the key planning considerations those being as follows –

- The principle of the development – the proposal is supported by policy in terms of renewable energy
- Landscape and visual impact – these considerations have been assessed and are considered acceptable
- Residential amenity – whereas there are dwellings situated within the 500m separation distance prescribed by the SPG On Shore Wind Energy an assessment has been conducted and given the nature of the landscape and screening it is not considered that the development would cause undue harm to those properties.

Councillor John Griffith in his capacity as a Local Member said that the matter had been discussed by the Community Council and whilst the Council does not oppose it he himself had been approached by residents nearby who were concerned by possible vibrations caused by the

turbine, by that fact that it would be visible from their properties and by the consequent effect on amenity.

Councillor Victor Hughes also pointed out that there are two properties nearby on the highway within the prescribed separation distance to the proposed wind turbine and that the proposal itself is relatively large. He proposed therefore that the application be refused. Councillor Nicola Roberts seconded the proposal.

The Planning Development Manager said that the report addresses the matter of the proximity of one property to the proposed turbine which lies approximately 300m from the turbine.

Councillor R.O.Jones said that the proposal is in a valley and that he did not believe it would be visible from most of the properties viewed on the site visit. He proposed that the application be accepted. Councillor W.T.Hughes seconded the proposal.

Councillors R.O.Jones and W.T.Hughes voted to approve the application; Councillors Victor Hughes and Nicola Roberts voted that it be rejected.

**It was resolved on the casting vote of the Chair to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation subject to the conditions listed in the written report.** *(Councillors Lewis Davies, Jeff Evans, Kenneth Hughes, and Raymond Jones did not vote on the application as they had not attended the site visit. Councillor John Griffith did not vote on the matter on account of his being a Local Member)*

*Councillor Ann Griffith was not present having left the meeting at 15.40 p.m.*

**7.3 46C247K/TR/EIA/ECON – A hybrid planning application proposing: Outline with all matters reserved except for means of access, for : A leisure village at Penrhos Coastal Park, London Road, Holyhead comprising: up to 500 new leisure units including new lodges and cottages; Central new hub building comprising reception with leisure facilities including indoor sub-tropical water park, indoor sports hall and cafes, bars, restaurants and retail; Central new Farmer's Market building; Central new spa and leisure building; A new café and water sports centre at the site of the former Boathouse; Demolition of the Bathing House and the construction of a restaurant at its former location; Demolition of other existing buildings including three agricultural barns and three residential dwellings; Providing and maintaining 29 hectares of publicly accessible areas with public car parking and enhancements to the Coastal Path, including: Managed walkways within 15 hectares of woodland, the retention and enhancement of Grace's Pond, Lily Pond, Scout's pond with viewing platforms, the Pet Cemetery, War Memorial, the Pump House and picnic area with bird feeding stations and hides with educational and bilingual interpretation signage created throughout; Creation of a new woodland sculpture trail and boardwalks and enhanced connection to the Coastal Path; the beach will continue to be accessible to the public providing safe access to the shallow shelving water; A Combined Heat and Power Centre Land at Cae Glas: The erection of leisure village accommodation and facilities which have been designed to be used initially as a temporary construction workers accommodation complex for Wylfa B at land at Cae Glas, Parc Cybi, Holyhead comprising : Up to 315 lodges which will be initially sub-divided for nuclear workers accommodation; Central hub building providing reception and canteen ancillary to accommodation; A Park and Ride facility comprising up to 700 car parking spaces; a new hotel; A lakeside hub comprising restaurant, café, retail and bar; New grass football pitch and cricket pitch; and a Combined Heat and Power Centre. To be subsequently converted (post Wylfa B construction) into an extension to the Penrhos Coastal Park Leisure Village comprising: Refurbished lodges and facility buildings to create high quality holiday accommodation (up to 315 family lodges); A Visitor Centre and Nature Reserve allowing controlled public access; and Heritage Centre with visitor parking. Land at Kingsland: the erection of a residential development which has been designed to be used initially as temporary construction workers' accommodation at land at Kingsland, Kingsland Road, Holyhead comprising: Up to 360 new houses to be initially used as temporary construction workers' accommodation. To be subsequently converted (post Wylfa B construction) into a residential development comprising: Up to 360 residential dwellings set in high quality**

**landscaping and open spaces. Each phase of development will have ancillary development comprising car parking, servicing areas, open spaces and plant. Full detail for the change of use of the existing Estate building at Penrhos Coastal Park, London Road, Holyhead including the change for :The Bailiffs Tower and outbuildings at Penrhos Home farm from a cricket clubhouse to a visitors' information centre, restaurant, café, bars and retail; Home Farm Barn and Cart Buildings from farm buildings to cycle and sports hire centre; the Tower from residential to a Manager's accommodation and ancillary office; and Beddmanarch House from residential to a visitors' centre – Penrhos Coastal Park, Cae Glas and Kingsland, Holyhead.**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is a major planning application which is a departure from the development plan and is accompanied by an Environment Statement.

*Councillor John Griffith declared a personal [but not prejudicial interest] in this application and he remained at the meeting throughout the discussion and voted thereon. Councillor J.Arwel Roberts although not a member of the Committee also declared a personal interest in the application, but did not make any contribution to the discussions as a Local Member.*

The Chair explained that given the nature and magnitude of this application the Public Speakers would be permitted a six minute timeslot instead of the customary three minutes in order to put their views to the Committee. The Chair then invited Mrs Hilary Paterson Jones, an objector to the proposal to address the Committee.

Mrs Paterson Jones said:

- She was a representative of the Save Penrhos Nature Park Holyhead Group which had 2,500 followers on its Facebook Page and which comprised of local residents opposed to the proposals for Penrhos, Cae Glas and Kingsland on the grounds of a loss of public amenity and environmental impact.
- There have been four petitions with a total of 3,285 signatories and the groups knew of approximately 500 plus letters of objection that have been submitted. From the very beginning there have been issues with councillors who have been predetermining these applications. The guidance suggests that they should not be doing this and that only that morning a councillor on BBC Wales and BBC Cymru, and Radio Wales was speaking out about how good these applications are and how they were already passed.
- The Council acknowledges that the majority of the Kingsland application site is outside the defined settlement boundary of the proposal map of the Ynys Môn Local Plan for Holyhead. The Council says that weight should be attached to the UDP boundary in the vicinity of the site. However, Penrhos clearly lies outside of this development boundary and the PPW states that before major developments are permitted, it should be demonstrated that a coastal location is essential, but it was not essential and she referred to Sherwood Forest and Longleat which are not coastal parks and yet they run very well.
- She queried whether this joint application is not just a means to smuggle through a profitable housing scheme inside an AONB on the back of a leisure facility that may never happen if Wylfa B does not go ahead. Planning Policy Wales edition 5 refers to the issue of prematurity which may arise when a local development plan is in preparation and also provides sufficient grounds to refuse the planning permission for this current application.
- That there should be separate planning applications for each of the three sites and there is no necessary linkage between the need for the three sites which, according to Planning Policy Wales, is important for meeting these tests for major development in an AONB. It is unlikely that these proposals taken separately would pass this rigorous examination required by PPW.
- An AONB would not normally be chosen for either a 400 housing development site or a temporary industrial accommodation for up to 3,500 people in Holyhead, for providing housing for Wylfa construction workers and a tourist development. This should not be considered as a single application not least because the timing of Wylfa B is uncertain.

- If the AONB is to have any meaning, developments such as this proposal must be rejected. Despite all of these departures, the Planning Officers have recommended approval – that baffled her.
- Suspicion exists that the original CCW objection was withdrawn by Natural Resources Wales as a result of political pressure. Currently, a Freedom of Information request has been submitted to establish whether this is the case.
- Iolo Williams, the wildlife ornithologist and TV presenter knows Penrhos well, and wrote “I am writing to support your efforts to protect Penrhos Nature Reserve and its incredible variety of wildlife. There are few precious places like this left. It would be a tragedy if this site was to be developed. I therefore object wholeheartedly to these proposals.”
- Eleven hectares (27 acres) of trees will be felled in Penrhos. The Natural Tree Trust says that the public complains about the Amazon Rain forests yet in Britain woodland is lost faster than the rainforests.
- Penrhos Nature Reserve attracts 100,000 visitors per year and ranks as the third highest tourist attraction on Anglesey. Mrs Jones asked why this could not be built elsewhere and for this to continue to be used as a tourist attraction. If a private project depends on public subsidy then the Environmental Impact Assessment should make this clear.
- This developer is already seeking a £10m grant from public funding to finance a development whose impact would be a loss of public access to a very large area of woodland of high amenity value and rich biodiversity which has been treasured by local residents and tourists for over 40 years. She read out an excerpt from a book by Ken Williams – Wildlife in Custody – which she considered relevant to today’s proceedings. The Group feel that Penrhos belongs to them and that there is no reason why the community could not lease or mortgage Penrhos and run it by the community for the community.
- Today’s decision is entire a matter for Members and that it lies in their hands just like it did in Ken Williams’s day. She thanked the Committee for its attention.

Councillor John Griffith said that in the course of the debate there would inevitably be points raised about the developments at Penrhos, Cae Glas and Kingsland providing excellent economic benefits for Holyhead and Anglesey and he asked Mrs Paterson Jones for her views regarding that argument.

Mrs Paterson Jones replied that she could not see how that could be because she believed that everything would be focussed on the Leisure Centre and that people would not leave the centre for the town - that is not going to happen. There will be shops and other facilities and everything there for them. Mrs Jones said that visitors go there and they remain there.

There were no further questions to Mrs Jones from the Committee’s Members.

The Chair than proceeded to invite Mr Richard Sidi, Chief Executive of Land and Lakes to speak in support of the proposal. The Chair explained that Mr Sidi would be accompanied by Mr Jon Suckley who would provide a response to any technical questions raised.

Mr Sidi as the applicant said:

- He stood before the Committee committed to a unique opportunity for Anglesey that supports it as the Energy Island and promotes it as the Enterprise Island. It is four years since Land and Lakes approached Anglesey Aluminium with its vision and they recognised Land and Lakes’ experience, its sound financial backing and its history of delivering large scale transformational development in the UK and its understanding of the existing public amenity.
- Land and Lakes will steward this important site and ensure the legacy benefits. The scheme balances huge economic benefits and substantial job creation with the preservation and enhancement of important landscape and heritage.
- Land and Lakes wish to be a partner in Anglesey for the long term and in preparing the scheme it has adopted an open and responsive approach. Its planning has required very sensitive landscape led thinking and extensive community led consultation.

- At every stage the developer has listened carefully to feedback and where possible it has made changes. Consultation has included a public exhibition, a radio debate, the circulation of 5,000 leaflets, meetings with residents' associations, schools, community groups, town council and the Welsh Government. The developer's website has been continually updated with the responses and most importantly, gives the history of the plans as they have evolved. The scheme will deliver considerable public benefit:
  - At Penrhos, the designation of the coastal path as a public right of way, public access to the 73 acres of land including 37 acres of woodland; a new visitor centre at Beddmynach House; 5 miles of paths, trails and access to two new coastal restaurants – all paid for and managed by the developer forever.
  - At Cae Glas there will be a new 100 acre nature reserve with its own dedicated visitor centre on land which is currently inaccessible to the public.
  - At Kingsland there will be 50% affordable housing with new areas of public open space and woodland planting.
- Members may not be aware that for the past 2 ½ years Land and Lakes has been voluntarily contributing to the annual £250k maintenance budget to keep Penrhos Coastal path open and safe for the public to use as a recognised valuable amenity. Members should not underestimate the cost of actively managing the woodland, the paths, the parking, the security and buildings that have been repaired all the time and public liability insurances. This can only continue with another sustainable business to support it.
- Land and Lakes are committed to high quality as can be seen in its 200 page Design and Access Statement. Design and build that will meet exemplar standards and be highly sustainable.
- The Leisure village will be unique in that it will be located close to the coastline with great infrastructure links and will incorporate extensive indoor facilities providing a stunning year round tourist attraction. The road and rail links to mainland UK, ferry links from Dublin and the quality of the scheme will ensure a successful new destination that will effectively grow the tourist market rather than displace existing businesses.
- Tourism Partnership North Wales strongly supports the proposal. The developer will celebrate the Welsh language; Welsh food and Welsh culture and will provide a flagship development for Wales.
- This provides a unique opportunity for Anglesey to prepare to take advantage of the nuclear new build programme and deliver a substantial legacy whilst minimising the impact on the existing tourism industry. The developer's involvement with Horizon Nuclear Power also dates back nearly four years and their letter of support recognises the development as of potentially strategic importance to the future development of the proposed nuclear new build at Wylfa.
- In recognition of the fact that major new developments can have an impact on local services a comprehensive range of measures included in a Legal Agreement will deliver an investment in the capacity of the local services to cater for the increased demand.
- The Committee report recognises that there is a national need for this development but there is a vitally important local need for regeneration in Holyhead. This is a unique time for Anglesey and the developer was presenting a unique opportunity for the Island that will benefit not only this generation but provide a real legacy for generations to come.
- In conclusion he said that he hoped the Members would grasp this opportunity and support the application.

Councillor Victor Hughes asked whether the leisure facilities at Penrhos would be available to the residents of Cae Glas and vice versa. Mr Sidi confirmed that they would be available to Cae Glas residents and that they were linked to Cae Glas. Tourist and visitors to Cae Glas would use the facilities at Penrhos.

Councillor Victor Hughes then wished to know how the two sites would be linked given that only a single track bridge crosses the railway and the A55 and whether any consideration had been given to walkers going from one site to the other who will have to cross the A5. Mr Sidi said that

the current link is via the roadway and is about 2 miles around but the developer's intentions are to improve that linkage over the A55 bridge for cycling, pedestrian and road trails – there is an intention to move to that at the next level – to utilise the existing bridge where possible. Cae Glas would not become a legacy/tourist use until after a nuclear new build workforce has been accommodated – so one could be looking at 5 to 10 years from now at which point it is the intention to ensure that the linkage is appropriate.

Councillor Victor Hughes referred to the proposal to allocate 100 acres at Cae Glas as a nature reserve for local people and he asked whether that contained land polluted by the old Penrhos infill site. Mr Sidi confirmed that the land referred to is inclusive of that area as well and that that land needs further work. A lot of work had been done in terms of its remediation over the years by Anglesey Aluminium but the developer would continue to remediate and look at those leachates as part of the mitigation.

Councillor Victor Hughes asked whether the developer would be likely to face the costs of that work. Mr Sidi confirmed that that was so and that it was part of the mitigation measures to address that.

Councillor Victor Hughes sought clarification of what provision there would be to persuade the residents of Cae Glas not to use Ffordd Towyn Capel which is totally unsuitable for heavy traffic as an access to the site. Mr Sidi said that the way the access has been arranged to is to funnel that traffic out back through Parc Cybi and not to have it doubling back onto Lôn Trefignath. So there will be an effort to ensure that it isn't to be utilised by residents and visitors to Cae Glas.

Councillor Victor Hughes wanted to know how it would be done. Mr Sidi said it would be done by traffic management and the way the junction is configured to ensure that guests are aware of that traffic flow.

Councillor Hughes finally asked what persuaded Land and Lakes of the need for permanent housing on the Kingsland site at the end of the Wylfa B construction phase. Mr Sidi said that permanent housing provides an element of affordable housing and it is about providing a mix of sustainable benefits rather than its being all leisure accommodation. There is a limit and what is felt to be a critical mass that is appropriate to the leisure village and the housing is another mix that it is thought is appropriate for the area. The affordable housing provision is a really strong benefit.

Councillor Ken Hughes referred to Mrs Paterson Jones's comments that the three proposals should have been presented separately and he asked for an explanation why had the three proposals been presented as one single application. Mr Sidi explained that the application is presented as a single application because it is an integrated scheme and each element of the scheme works in conjunction with each other. For instance, Cae Glas is a leisure legacy after a nuclear new build workforce accommodation that links to Penrhos. Cae Glas cannot work on its own just as a leisure/tourism attraction because it needs coastal access – there must be an USP. Mrs Hilary Paterson Jones mentioned that a coastal location is not important – it is, in fact very important because it has to be ensured that the development stands out and that it is different from the Centre Parks model otherwise the development would just be a competitor to their very strong brand. It is important that Anglesey shows off its coastline – that is what it is famous for. So Cae Glas must be linked to Penrhos. Kingsland must be linked to Cae Glas because Cae Glas has the facilities - the catering and central facilities that are required for the nuclear new build accommodation for the workers on Kingsland. So each element has to be linked together – it is one integrated scheme.

Councillor Jeff Evans referred that it has been alluded and widely reported that Land and Lakes are requesting grants in support of up to £10m. He asked should the grants not be forthcoming whether the private finance would still be available and whether it would be enough to continue with the project.

Mr Sidi said that it is not a grant that has been applied for but a loan as part of a regional investment for Wales loan. If the developer can apply for loans as part of the overall funding package that is relevant to the regeneration of the area, then the developer will apply for it. The developer's own funding is quite large scale. There are a variety of funding elements that need to be put in place and most of those are already in place even at this early stage – the loan is only one part of the whole funding package.



Councillor Ann Griffith referred to the statement made by the applicant that the scheme would celebrate the Welsh language and culture and she asked him to explain what he meant by that. Mr Sidi said that the developer wanted Penrhos to be different and to celebrate what is important about this area. If the Irish and visitors from mainland UK are to be attracted then the developer needs to make it different and unique. It has a great coastline and great natural heritage and history. The developer wants to bring some of the rich Welsh culture to that experience for guests and make them feel they're abroad. The Welsh language is equally very important. It is a simple fact that the developer needs to create something different and Wales and Anglesey has that to offer.

Councillor John Griffith said that there was nothing in the written report that he had seen that says that Land and Lakes is the owner of these sites. He asked whether the developer had come to an agreement with Anglesey Aluminium over leasing this land or buying this land. Mr Sidi confirmed that the developer had a formal legal agreement to purchase this land; it is subject to receiving satisfactory planning permission and if that planning permission is satisfactory then the developer will purchase the land. It is a legally binding contract.

Councillor John Griffith asked exactly how many similar schemes had the applicant delivered; where are they located and how many did he still operate. Mr Sidi said that the developer was part of the Kingmoor Park Property Group which has the largest North West Industrial Commercial site in the UK - 400 acres that was developed from nothing to now employing 1500 people. There is also the Kingwood Park site in Wrexham which is another 150 acre site which had just recently received planning for another 400,000 ft. of warehouse distribution and there is another site in Leigh that is residential and commercial letting. Mr Sidi said that his experience involves the leisure business – he was a house builder – but that he had been in the leisure business for the last seven years. He had been involved with operating, managing and developing twelve leisure centre sites across the UK which of nearly 2,000 units of holiday accommodation. The developer has a history of getting the planning permission and delivering on it.

Councillor John Griffith enquired whether Land and Lakes would still be running the proposed scheme in 10 to 15 years' time or was it their intention to sell it off or have other people running it. Mr Sidi said that the developer has a history – Kingmoor Park and Land and Lakes – of holding the assets. Kingmoor Park has been in ownership for 15 years. It is a long term involvement with Anglesey – he had said that in his presentation and he held to that.

Councillor John Griffith said that that the developer would be accommodating 3,000 to 4,000 workers from the proposed Wylfa site. He asked whether the developer had a legal agreement with Horizon to carry out this work. Mr Sidi replied that they hadn't, but that the developer has worked with Horizon Nuclear Power for four years since it came to approach Anglesey Aluminium. Horizon's whole arrangement has changed since RWE and E-ON fell away and now Hitachi are the new owners. The developer has established a good relationship and understanding of why and what Horizon is doing and this is a perfect fit for what they want. But there is no formal legal agreement and there can't be until they are further down the line of getting a milestone for themselves which probably involves the strike price being announced by the Government. So the developer has a relationship with Horizon but no formal contract.

Councillor John Griffith then wanted to know whether Horizon are in favour, or against the proposals. Mr Sidi said that they are 100% in favour. They have written a letter of support that is part of this application. Mr Sidi said that he had pointed out in his presentation that Horizon see this to be of strategic importance to the Wylfa new build so they are 100% supportive.

Councillor John Griffith said that reference is made to the fact that there would be great strain, pressure and demand on some of the emergency services on Anglesey and particularly in the area of Holyhead. There are suggestions that the developer contributes towards new libraries, new health centres a new leisure centre and probably new schools. Would the developer go ahead with those conditions. Mr Sidi said that the developer had stated that it would mitigate. This is the first application with anything to do with the nuclear new build and the developer has said that it will mitigate and that it will contribute and make a financial contribution but assessed prior to the development going forward at which point Horizon Nuclear Power will have assessed their necessary mitigation. So, in the round, the developer is making sure that that mitigation is available for the local area and it will have to make sure that it has an appropriate contract with Horizon Nuclear Power. Mr Sidi emphasised that he was making the point that Cae Glas and

Kingsland cannot be developed without nuclear agreeing to a contract to actually house the workers on the site.

Councillor John Griffith asked whether the developer could give a rough idea of what its contribution was likely to be. Mr Sidi said that he could not since the scheme was only at an outline application stage. The developer is stating a principle and will look at the detail much farther down the line. But the developer is making a commitment.

Councillor John Griffith asked the applicant how he could justify a development of this size that basically will ruin the AONB coastline and these areas for many, many years to come. Mr Sidi said that he understood the issue of development within the AONB. But the whole of Anglesey's coastline is an AONB effectively. The developer is developing 0.5% of Anglesey's AONB to provide something unique and a real step change, a transformational development to change the fortunes of Holyhead specifically, but also Anglesey and if not North Wales. Mr Sidi said that he thought that everything had to be put in context and that that is what the Committee report has assessed.

Councillor Ann Griffith referred to the issue of pollutants on a particular area near the Inland Sea. - an area that for the last 40 years has been used as a tip for Anglesey Aluminium but prior to that it was a landfill site for many, many years. She asked the applicant what toxicology tests had been carried out so far and when was it anticipated that area will become open to the public. Mr Sidi, having consulted with Mr Suckley, replied that numerous technical assessments had been done to look at that area. The developer is committed to ensuring that those leachate breakouts are resolved. That ground has been capped and landscaped for many years and gas monitoring has been done on that site for many years. He was confident the developer would be able bring that back into the public use without a problem.

Councillor John Griffith said that there are a number of historical or archaeological sites. Will the developer's plans involve disturbing, removing or ruining some of these sites. Mr Sidi explained that there are historical issues above ground and potential archaeological issues below ground. Above ground it is very much about bringing those properties back into use again and actually maintaining and enhancing those historical assets. That is very much key to the developer's tourist offer as well. He said that the developer will carry out a conservation management plan which is a very in-depth study. Initial studies of all the heritage assets on the site have been done and that will continue – it is an intrinsic part of the developer's offer to the tourist.

Councillor John Griffith asked whether the high powered gas pipeline that goes through the Cae Glas site was to remain in situ. Mr Sidi confirmed that it would definitely remain in situ. He explained that it does not go through the site but runs almost parallel with the A55, so the developer has no intentions of disturbing or moving it.

Councillor Nicola Roberts asked whether the development will go ahead if Wylfa does not come. Mr Sidi replied that all three sites are linked together but if Wylfa does not progress, the developer cannot build Cae Glas or Kingsland. Penrhos is a stand-alone leisure destination that has enough critical mass to develop on its own and also the nature reserve on Cae Glas.

Councillor Nicola Roberts wanted to know how that related to a hybrid application. Mr Suckley explained that a hybrid application means one where some elements are in outline and others are in full detail. The majority of the application is proposed in outline: all the nuclear workers' accommodation and their legacy uses and the majority of the leisure development. The detailed elements of the proposals relate to the change of use of the existing buildings, so that is what is meant by hybrid. He said that the intention is to progress with all of it and that the feedback which Land and Lakes have had through their discussions with Horizon over the last for years is supportive and, subject to securing the planning permission, the developer hopes to move forward with the nuclear workers' development. If a legal agreement can't be agreed then Cae Glas and Kingsland wouldn't come forward for development.

Responding to a point from Councillor Kenneth Hughes, Mr Sidi said that the planning permission is only dependent on initially accommodating Wylfa nuclear workforce therefore it has no value. If Wylfa does not utilise it, then it cannot be developed therefore it is agricultural land. Mr Suckley added that there is an obligation which would be imposed on the planning permission if a deal could not be done with Horizon and nuclear workers' accommodation couldn't be developed, then no development would happen on Cae Glas or Kingsland sites as part of this development.

Councillor John Griffith said that his brother was heavily involved in the running of the cricket pitch at Penrhos and if Cae Glas does not go ahead what facilities will be available similar to the cricket pitch to be removed from Penrhos. Mr Sidi said that an alternative cricket field and football pitches will be provided on sites which are shown on Cae Glas. To be clear, if Wylfa does not progress or does not accommodate workers on Cae Glas or Kingsland, Penrhos will be developed and a new cricket pitch, football pitches and new nature reserve will be provided on Cae Glas and that is all that the developer can develop on Cae Glas. But it offers mitigation for developing Penrhos.

Councillor John Griffith asked Mr Sidi what assurance could he give that the figure of between 450 and 600 people employed at Penrhos or across all three sites will be from Anglesey. Mr Sidi said that the developer is making a commitment that it will prioritise local labour and that it will provide training and apprenticeships to train local people. The developer suggests a university of hospitality where the developer will look to train and bring local people into a career. It is the interest of the developer to employ local people – it wants to employ locals and it makes sense for it to do so in providing a Welsh leisure village.

Councillor Ann Griffith referred to the land at Kingsland as being good agricultural land. She asked Mr Sidi whether consideration had been given to developing alternative sites. Mr Suckley said in reply that as part of the planning application an alternative site assessment was undertaken which is covered in the Committee report which assesses alternative sites for the leisure development and for the nuclear workers' accommodation. As part of that it was considered that there were no alternative preferential sites for this development which is the view that is supported by officers in the Committee report.

The Chair thanked both Mr Sidi and Mr Suckley for the presentation and responses and he invited the Chief Planning Officer to give the Planning Authority's perspective with regard to the application.

Mr Gwyndaf Jones, Chief Planning Officer said that:

- Many of the issues which he had intended to refer to had been addressed by the applicant in his responses to Members' questions. He acknowledged that the application is an enormous application and that the recommendation is based on a thorough assessment of the relevant elements. The process has been supported by external solicitors, Burgess Salmon.
- Petitions and correspondence have been received both for and against the proposed development. A petition with 45 signatories was received just prior to the meeting and there is a Go Online Petition with 1,045 signatories. There is also a petition objecting to the proposal signed by 203 young people. The report on the application makes clear the strength of feeling generated by it. Whilst those views are respected by Planning Officers, the application must be dealt with on its planning merits and should the recommendation of approval with conditions be accepted then the application under current rules will be referred to the Welsh Government for commentary.
- A site visit to all three sites has also been undertaken. This application is a precursor to the kind of application that could be presented if Horizon and Hitachi decide to proceed with the Wylfa B development. He said that the nuclear workers' accommodation provision is integral to the application and should the agreement between the developer and Horizon not be realised then the proposals for Cae Glas and Kingsland will not go ahead with the exception of the nature reserve and cricket/football pitches at Cae Glas.
- The Development Plan is historical – there is the Structure Plan; a Local Plan and the Stopped UDP. The question is what weight should be given to the relevant policies. More weight should be given to the Stopped UDP as the most recent and this approach has been acknowledged by the Welsh Government. Whilst it is not part of the Development Plan it is a material planning consideration which the Committee should assess.
- The development provides an opportunity to transform the economy, environment and society of Holyhead and the Island. It is worth £200m and there will be a contribution in mitigation of the social and community effects.
- The report contains 32 draft heads of terms for a section 106 agreement which places the onus on the developer and the Committee's approval is sought to give delegated authority to the Head of Planning Service to negotiate those terms.

- Anglesey as an Island has seen a steady decline in its economy e.g. the workforce at Anglesey Aluminium has reduced from 1500 to 15.
- Officers have given attention and regard to all the comments presented in respect of this application. Any loss of public access to Penrhos will be mitigated by opening an area on Cae Glas.
- Careful consideration has been given to the AONB since all three sites fall within the AONB. Paragraph 5.5.6 of Planning Policy Wales sets out the considerations in dealing with this aspect. Officers have weighed and balanced all the relevant considerations. The proposal does not tick all the boxes and if it did then the recommendation would be an easy one to make. It does not and officers have looked carefully at it; there have been discussions over the course of two years in order to seek to ensure that in assessing it the Officers are satisfied with the development and are satisfied in presenting it with a recommendation and that the best has been obtained for the residents of Anglesey through the mitigation measures proposed.

Mr David Pryce Jones, Case Officer for the application, updated the Committee on developments and/or changes in the period since the report was completed and issued with reference to the following:

- Page 61. Welsh Water has indicated that it is satisfied with the development and that they have no objection on the basis that the sewerage system is upgraded.
- Page 82. The reference in the first full paragraph to Penrhos and Cae Glas should read Cae Glas and Kingsland.
- Page 83. With reference to the SSSI, Natural Resources Wales have provided further commentary explaining that that designation is dependent on a broader habitat than simply the ornithological aspect referred to in the paragraph.
- Page 95 .The reference in head of terms 31 to 30 lodges should read 300.
- Following the receipt of observations by Natural Resources Wales who have withdrawn their objection to the Kingsland development on the basis that urban woodland is created as part of that development, an additional head of terms is proposed to reflect this requirement.
- Page 95. Planning condition 2 states that any subsequent application for the approval of reserved matters shall be made to the Planning Authority not later than the expiration of 10 years beginning with the date of the permission. This is twice the normal timeframe due to the size of the development; because it is a phased development and because of the uncertainty as to whether the sites will be used in connection with nuclear development.

Members of the Committee were then shown site maps for each of the three constituent development sites.

The Chief Planning Officer said that he had become aware over the course of the past weekend that Members of the Committee had received a letter from the developer. He pointed out that this is a matter for which the developer is responsible having had no encouragement from Planning Officers although the Planning Office is in receipt of the letter. An e-mail communication has also been sent to some Members by Friends of the Earth. A copy has been included in the correspondence file that is available for inspection.

Councillor John Griffith at this point said that he believed that he needed to declare a personal interest to the effect that his brother does unpaid coaching work with the Anglesey Aluminium cricket club. He stated that this would not affect his thoughts regarding the application and that he would keep an open mind and determine the application on its merits.

Councillor Jeff Evans speaking as a Local Member said that “change, like sunshine, can be a friend or foe, a blessing or a curse, a dawn or a dusk.” He said that the Land and Lakes application is about change and that it has created a wealth of differences of opinion that places councillors in an extremely difficult and unenviable situation, for rightfully, everyone has a view based on personal beliefs, effects and circumstances. He pointed out that Local Members are allowed to speak but not to vote on planning matters within their wards and that in fact the six members of Caergybi and Ynys Gybi are not allowed to vote today. Councillor Evans said that this had been a difficult application with so many people positively in favour of the same but also so many others who are totally against it. Councillor Evans said that it is a fact that Penrhos Coastal Path is owned and managed by Anglesey Aluminium and that the cost annually to keep

this facility open is £250k and with the plant business no longer operational this on-cost cannot and will not continue. The public however has used and enjoyed the Park's facilities over so many years – 40 plus and wish to see it continue. With the current planning application, the public fear that the opportunity to access the park will be taken away, reduced and/or lost. Against this fear and opinion, Land and Lakes give assurances that they will enhance and secure the Park's future including public access to 73 acres of land and woodland, together with a new public right of way. Of major concern is the housing development at Kingsland and Cae Glas and its envisaged potential negative impact and effects on the area and its inhabitant householders but there was affordable housing offered. He referred also to a distinct difference of opinion as to the economic benefits and long-term future especially as they apply to employment opportunities. Land and Lakes' forecast the creation of 400 full time construction jobs with long-term sustainable employment for circa 600 full time equivalent permanent jobs which are badly needed locally. Local people fear they will not acquire the construction jobs and that the forecast for 600 full time jobs is greatly exaggerated and will be less in number, many of a part-time nature and relatively low paid. It was difficult to list all the pros and cons in a Local Member's speech and the effects both good and potentially bad across Holyhead and Anglesey and that it was extremely difficult to make the case and to reassure either side of the argument and opinion. He said that it was for planning officers to assess the acceptability of the application against policy but it is for Members to endorse or reject the application. Whatever decision is reached there will be happy and unhappy persons at the result. He said that he did not envy the task but and added that it was considerations such as these as difficult as they are for which Members were elected.

Councillor Raymond Jones as a Local Member stated that 4,500 names at least on a petition did not want this development but that it might be possible also to go out and find 4,500 who wanted it. He said that it was a conundrum. He could not see such a development happening in a small place like Holyhead. He expressed concern as to possible loss of Penrhos beach. This will not be an area of natural beauty but rather the proposal will destroy the area. He did not believe that anyone could doubt that that this is a beautiful area which is going to be affected. Councillor Jones said that he understood developers wanting to make money but that he did not understand ordinary people who would willingly allow this to happen. As regards jobs, he did not believe that local people will get jobs because there are no tradesmen on Anglesey. He questioned from where readily trained tradesmen would be coming. Councillor Jones also said that he was annoyed that as a Local Member he could not vote on the matter and yet others could vote. His vote was only one vote and he would not destroy the Planning department by having one vote but at least it was the respect of having a vote.

Councillor R.Llewelyn Jones as a third Local Member referred to TAN 20 which sets out the requirements in respect of large scale housing applications. He said that a letter from the Joint Planning Policy Unit states that in 2012 there is sufficient planned housing provision for the next 6 years. Moreover there are 500 homes in Holyhead in the Newry Beach area which have received planning consent with a further 2,000 on the current application – there is enough provision in the county for the next six years and on top of that there will be another 2,500. He asked what would granting consent to all these houses do to the language and the Island's way of life. He suggested that it would be more appropriate for the Committee to refer the application to the full Council for determination given that the six Local Members for Holyhead and Ynys Cybi do not have any opportunity to vote on the matter. He thought that this was not democratic and he pointed out that he had been elected to represent Holyhead and Anglesey but that under current rules he had no input. Ynys Cybi is in an AONB. The developer is being recommended consent for 2,000 properties in an AONB and he asked how much money is to be made from such an application. He further pointed out that there was nothing to say where all the jobs would be and who would be given them and that it was completely contrary to the Unitary Development Plan. Those houses will not be for local people even though they are said to be affordable housing. As it stands, there will be 9 Members determining an application so important which is the biggest leisure plan to come before the Council. He said that he believed there was something wrong when the Local Members and the full Council did not have an input especially given what might be the effects of the development on the way of life of Holyhead and Anglesey and on the language. He therefore asked the Committee to reject the application and that it be brought back to the full Council. Officers have said that the development plan is dated and that they cannot

work to that and so a decision is being taken on the hoof. If the plan is dated, then Members should be given the right to update it.

The Legal Services Manager advised that the Council's Constitution makes it clear, at section 3.4.3, that it is the Planning Committee's responsibility to determine planning applications and that it has no right to refer the matter to the full Council.

The Chair then opened the discussion to Members to comment on the application's merits.

Councillor Ann Griffith said that she had been questioning the potential social effects of the application and that one thing she would have liked to have seen was a report by Social Services. Whilst she understood that that was not a requirement under planning rules she felt that with an application on this scale it was important to receive their response. This being so she said that she was disappointed to see that there are only two lines covering the Social Services' response within the report. However what they do say on Page 84 of the report, is that the scale of the workers' accommodation proposed could result in increased demand for child social services and that this would need to be mitigated. Councillor Griffith said that although they do not give an indication of what mitigating measures might be needed, she was aware that there is already a great strain on Social Services. She asked whether there was more information available than that contained within the report.

The Chief Planning Officer confirmed that discussion had taken place with Social Services. They have said that they are happy with the Planning Section being able to mitigate those effects via a Legal Agreement as set out in the report.

The Case Officer said that mitigation measures have been set out but as with much information in the report, it is not known how many workers are involved and how much mitigation will be required and that is why the report is not able to go any further at this point.

The Chief Planning Officer said that he would like to respond to some of the points made from the floor. He said that it was evident that there are strong feelings in relation to this development particularly as expressed by one of the Local Members, Councillor Raymond Jones. He acknowledged that many people had written in and that the petition was testament to that fact. However, whilst he did not wish to undermine those feelings, the application has to be assessed on the basis of the planning considerations and the Development Plan. From his own experience of working in this Authority's Planning Service he could not recall an application where more correspondence was received in support of a development rather than against it. But officers have had to weigh and measure all the considerations, and any element that has been raised that is material in planning terms has been assessed. If it is not a planning consideration, officers are not able to assess it. He believed that there were sufficient conditions and heads of terms to mitigate the development. He pointed out that if the Government permits the development of a nuclear facility, workers will be coming into Anglesey and the Authority will be required to make provision for them and it must be prepared for that discussion. The heads of terms do make reference to apprenticeships and Mr Sidi has referred to a commitment whereby young apprentices will start out on that process now. This is the process that Horizon and Centrica will follow as regards putting a benefit in, in the form of local apprenticeships so that they are in place and ready to take advantage of the development when it comes, subject to Government confirmation. The Officer said that he could not therefore agree with the point made about the lack of apprenticeships. Reference has been made also to the scale of the housing involved i.e. 2000/2,500 units ; what is being proposed are 500 leisure units at Penrhos; up to 315 lodges at Cae Glas and up to 360 houses in Kingsland. Discussions are on-going with regard to the UDP. The fact that the Joint Planning Policy Unit has just consulted on the preferred strategy means that the Members are fortunate in that they are engaging early in the Development Plan process. It is clear from the mitigation conditions and the terms of the Section 106 agreement that an assessment of the residential elements of the development will be made after the workers have departed which will be in about out 8 to 10 years. The situation will be assessed at that time with a view to obtaining benefit with 50% of the housing at Kingsland being affordable housing. On the matter of the Welsh Language, the Joint Planning Policy Unit has reviewed the Welsh Language impact assessment as reflected in the report and whilst the assessment acknowledges that there will be an impact it is possible that that can be mitigated. The Officer said that Members are unable to not determine an application until all guidance is updated or otherwise. The Authority will never be in a position when all plans and advice are up to date. The Officer said that he did not agree with the suggestion that officers are making a decision on the hoof. He referred to the 120 page report

and to the fact that a process of careful weighing and measuring had taken place supported by a legal evaluation in order to ensure that the application is presented in as thorough a manner as possible.

The Case Officer referred to a point raised by Councillor Raymond Jones with regard to there being no tradesmen in the area. The Officer referred Members to page 80 of the report wherein it was stated that the applicant has supported the application with a report by Regeneris in relation to the employment aspect and that one of the advantages of this development is that Anglesey has a higher percentage of tradespeople than North Wales.

Councillor Victor Hughes said that he had a number of concerns regarding the application. Firstly, the fact that Elected Members are to approve or reject the whole application as one project given that there are different considerations pertaining to each of the three sites. With regard to Penrhos Coastal Park, the land is private land and the idea of developing it into a majestic Centre Park with the coastline protected for the public's pleasure appeals greatly as it would generate work and if developed sensitively under careful supervision, would attract the right kind of tourists to the Island who will spend and thereby promote the economy. Councillor Hughes said that he had concerns regarding the linkage between this site and Cae Glas in the early years. He queried how many young families would wish to share such special facilities with Wylfa construction workers who would be enjoying a respite after a hard day's work. He didn't believe that the two were compatible. The risk was that the Penrhos Park facilities would be diluted to the extent that the enterprise would fail. As for Cae Glas this was a temporary site for Wylfa workers which would in due course be transformed into holiday lodges for the Penrhos Park. Councillor Hughes said that he was concerned by the pollution on site and that he wasn't sure whether Mr Sidi had seriously considered the likely cost of clearing and making safe the site as such costs can be enormous. He believed that a better assessment of that situation was required before a definite answer can be obtained. Also with regard to the access from Lôn Trefignath and the Cybi industrial estate, Councillor Hughes said that he was not sure that people will leave the site via Lôn Towyn Capel which as a narrow and winding road is inadequate for any amount of traffic and would cause a great deal of inconvenience to present residents. In relation to Kingsland, Councillor Hughes asked why was an application for permanent housing being made on this unique site. He said that there was very little good land remaining in Ynys Cybi and that the developer wants the area to lose these special green fields for ever. These fields create a natural buffer between Trearddur Bay and Holyhead and to lose those fields temporarily is one thing but to extend the boundaries of Holyhead Town to the green belt is quite another. Councillor Hughes said that no consideration would be given to allowing the erection of houses on this site in a normal situation so why permit this. Councillor Hughes went on to say that in addition to his comments about the three sites, the accommodation of so many construction workers in one area concerned him greatly as he did not think this to be very fair. He recalled the situation in the 60s and the impact which Trawsfynydd and Wylfa had on the communities wherein the workers lived, particularly problems in relation to law and order. Councillor Hughes said that he had been informed by the Police that they appreciated the co-operation between themselves, the Planning Department and Land and Lakes but that they had not as yet completed their impact assessment. Councillor Hughes also stated that he accepted that Welsh Water now approves the application and has withdrawn its objection. He said that he completely believed that the whole application is very premature and that much work remains to be done before he personally could accept such a development. There are dire concerns out in the community and Members should have heed of those concerns. People will defend their heritage and it is a duty on Members to support them without losing sight of the big picture. Councillor Hughes concluded that he could not support the application in its current form.

Councillor Lewis Davies referred to the application as one of the most complex he had come across as a county councillor with pressure to accept this hybrid development on three sites over 500 acres. After having visited the site and having carefully read the lengthy report the application had to be viewed objectively and the advantages and disadvantages weighed and measured. Councillor Davies queried the pressure on Members to accept the three sites together given that he felt it would have been easier to consider each one individually. He had looked at the following matters – the location on Ynys Cybi and the transport network; the effects on landscape; the effects on the environment; the historical landscape; the scientific landscape; tourism and the economy; the effects on society and also planning policies. Penrhos Park is a 197 acre country park forming part of the old Penrhos estate and is an AONB with a coastal path; ancient woodland and important archaeological and scientific sites. He said that the people of the area have enjoyed the park for generations as land open to the public with access to the coastline. The

application to develop 500 leisure units represents an over development of the area which could impede the freedom of the local people to enjoy this important landscape in an AONB. Councillor Davies emphasised Penrhos Park an important resource for tourists and residents of Anglesey. Cae Glas is a development of 269 acres again on land that is sensitive – agriculturally and scientifically and as woodland. Councillor Davies said that it was easier to accept development on part of this site because part of it is brownfield and has been used previously by Anglesey Aluminium; also there is access to the site from the A5. Should Wylfa B be realised then there are advantages to developing this site for 300 lodges; parking for 700 cars. Councillor Davies referred to the Kingsland application comprising the erection of up to 350 new homes to be used initially by Wylfa workers and then by local people. He queried whether so many new houses were required for Wylfa workers particularly if many will travel to the Island and there will be use of local labour. Councillor Davies proceeded to say that developing this site will cause traffic problems and will intrude into the countryside and detract from the AONB. It is important to retain a green belt between Holyhead and Trearddur; also there are already hundreds of housing applications on Ynys Cybi and many houses on sale. Councillor Davies said that each site has its merits but that he felt he could not accept all three together because of the effects on: the AONB; historical and scientific sites; effects on public amenity and the country park; effects on health and social services; law-breaking that might ensue; the Welsh Language and Education; pressure on infrastructure and highways. Welsh Water did object although the Committee has been informed that that is no longer the case. Councillor Davies referred to the risks to Penrhos as a coastal site of rising sea levels and to the fact that with global warming sea levels are rising. Also, concentrating so many workers and incomers could create large anti-social problems. Councillor Davies pointed out that the application is a departure from development plans and that he had seen from reading the report that a number of policies have been contravened by the application e.g. AONB Policy Section 85, Woodland Policy – 25% of Penrhyn woodland are to be felled; Landscape Character Policy - sections 1 and 3 of Ynys Môn Landscape Strategy; Policy 49 of the Ynys Môn Plan – part of Kingsland; Penrhos is outside of the countryside policy of the Ynys Môn Local Plan; Penrhos and Cae Glas sites are situated in an area that can be considered in policy terms as part of undeveloped coastline; under policy 36 in the Local Plan, development in undeveloped areas which are on or which border the coast must be managed rigorously and proposals must be physically and environmentally compatible with the area's character. Councillor Davies queried whether Penrhos could be considered as such. The Penrhos and Cae Glas sites come within an AONB and paragraph 5.5.6 of Planning Policy Wales notes that in national parks or in areas of natural beauty exceptional circumstances apply to large scale development proposals. Councillor Davies said that there is also a statutory duty to consider the protection and enhancement of an AONB. Councillor Davies also referred to supplementary guidance to the ENS policy of the Stopped UDP with regard to the green wedge denoted and earmarked and the green wedge which part of the Cae Glas site is within. Under Policy 11.1.3 of Planning Policy Wales there are policies that protect open spaces and under EN 7 of the Local Development Plan development is not permitted where unacceptable harm would occur to ancient woodland – 11 hectares in Penrhos. The Countryside and Wildlife Act protects wildlife and there is a risk to nature from this application. Councillor Davies asked whether there is a worth in having policies if they are ignored. Councillor Davies said he had major concerns with this hybrid application and that he could not support it as presented. He proposed that the three sites be discussed separately and that Penrhos be retained as it is for the benefit of the people of Anglesey as an important resource for tourists and as coastal country park. He added that the Countryside Council had objected to the proposals but that by today Natural Resources Wales, under political pressure as he had heard, had changed its stance. The majority of community councils around the area oppose the plan and regard must be had of public opinion. Councillor Davies said that that is extremely important with this application as one of the largest presented in North Wales.

The Chief Planning Officer stated with reference to comments by Councillors Victor Hughes and Lewis Davies that he was disappointed by statements to the effect that there is pressure to change recommendations and of policies being broken or ignored. He said that he did not agree with this proposition and did not accept those viewpoints. Neither did he know from where the evidence has come to suggest that Natural Resources Wales have come under political pressure and that he was unhappy with such a suggestion. Mention was made of Cae Glas and Penrhos and he re-emphasised that Cae Glas will be used like Kingsland as a site for workers – workers at Cae Glas will be there for a temporary period and will have their own facilities; users of Penrhos will also have their own facilities. It is not a case of mix and match and there will be no workers at



Penrhos. It is clear in the report that Penrhos is for leisure purposes, and that workers will be accommodated temporarily in Cae Glas and Kingsland. The Environmental Health Department has looked closely at the issue of pollution - there have been leachate problems; however the Officers discussed this matter with the developer and are satisfied by the means proposed in mitigation and there is also a condition to that effect.

The Senior Engineer (Development Control) said with regard to traffic issues that it has already been mentioned that the design of the junction will direct traffic towards Parc Cybi rather than Lôn Trefignath. However it cannot be guaranteed that no traffic will use that road, but because of the design that would be an exception. Also, a traffic management plan will be in place and the developer and Horizon will be able to manage who comes and goes.

The Chief Planning Officer proceeded to say that he would like to re-show the plans to highlight the difference between Penrhos, Cae Glas and Kingsland owing to some misconceptions. He would also like Members to understand that there is a difference in the Development Plan boundaries in light of the reference made to houses being built in Kingsland on a greenfield site. The Officer emphasised that the boundary has been already been added to and that land is allocated within the Stopped UDP for leisure use at Kingsland. The Leisure Department is not certain that it will realise that use; however it highlights the fact that land has been earmarked for development. It is therefore incorrect to say that only houses could be developed on this site and nothing else.

The Case Officer confirmed that the Police are satisfied with the development with conditions. Meetings have been held with the Police since the report was prepared and that matter has been dealt with. With reference to some of the environmental points raised, the report deals at length with some of the effects mentioned. He would also like to add that there has been a change in Planning Policy Wales which requires the balancing of economic, social and environmental effects and that occasionally, the economic effects outweigh the environmental effects. He therefore reiterated that officers had weighed and balanced the environmental effects and have dealt with each aspect in detail within the report.

The Case Officer said that he wished to draw attention to the dramatic change in Planning Policy Wales and to the greater emphasis in Planning Policy Wales on the economic perspective. The Officer then referred to the three site maps and reiterated the intentions with regard to each of the sites and the linkages that applied. The Officer referred to Appendices 1, 2, and 3 in the written report and explained what they showed. He referred to the Local Plan at Appendix 1, and highlighted Penrhos relative to the development boundary by reference to the site map. He explained that most of Cae Glas falls within an S1 designation in the Local Plan and comes within the development boundary. Much of Kingsland falls outside the development boundary but as has been explained in the report the Local Plan is dated and refers back to 1996 so weight has been given to the UDP which is a later policy document. The development boundary of the UDP goes around Anglesey Aluminium so that Penrhos borders with Holyhead. The employment designation with regard to Cae Glas is reduced so less of Cae Glas is within the development boundary but some does remain. As regards Kingsland, the situation has changed considerably with most of the site falling within the development boundary and as has been mentioned, the Leisure Department has no need for the leisure designation. So under the UDP, Kingsland is not in the countryside, Cae Glas is partly so and Penrhos borders Holyhead. In policy terms, Penrhos is about leisure use so a sequential approach is taken whereby it is advantageous for a development on this scale to border a town such as Holyhead. In sustainability terms it is a positive point and it is a weight in favour of the development.

At the request of the Chief Planning Officer, Mr Solomon of Burges Salmon said that with regard to the suggestion that the sites be considered separately, the proposals have been presented as a package so they need to be determined on the basis of one application.

Councillor John Griffith referred to the Kingsland site and he asked how does the intention to erect 350 workers accommodation units within 5 years stand with the intention thereafter to erect houses in 15 years' time and wouldn't this fall outside planning time limits. The Case Officer explained that the residential use of Kingsland applies only if the site is first developed for nuclear workers accommodation. Although it might not come forward until 2017 or 2019 the report acknowledges that there is sufficient housing provision in Holyhead and although that weighs against the application, the residential element will not come forward until 2017.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes said that he wished to thank the Planning Officers for a comprehensive report and having read the report and taken note of the arguments on both sides and listened to the speakers it is obvious that this hybrid application generates a great deal of interest for many. He said that he believed that the three sites individually represent major applications for Anglesey let alone the three together, but as that is the applicant's wish it must be respected and dealt with as it is presented. He referred to the fact that all the numerous considerations had been aired including an agreement with Wylfa which has been confirmed. He asked whether members want to see a prosperous Island providing work for young people and whether they want to keep young people on the Island to raise their families. He asked the Committee to consider those factors very carefully.

Councillor Ann Griffith said that in reading the Language Assessment she had noted that the Joint Planning Policy Unit had considered the independent report by Land and Lakes and that mention is made that the Welsh Language is under threat in areas such as London Road, Kingsland and Trearddur. It is noted in the report that between 2001 and 2011 there has been a reduction of 11% in Welsh speakers in those areas. The report suggests that a development such as this might possibly contribute to a further reduction in the use of the language in this area. She said that what she saw was a forecast of further deterioration should the development go ahead. After Wylfa A there had been a serious effect on the Welsh language in Ysgol Bae Cemaes and that area at the time.

The Chief Planning Officer responded by saying that as regards young people leaving the island and the effects on culture, the Planning Department has worked with the developer to ensure provision of apprenticeships and to ensure as far as possible, that opportunities will be given to local people. This is one positive way of protecting the Welsh Language and retaining young people on the Island.

The Case Officer referred to Page 86 of the report which stated that the area has a lower proportion of Welsh speakers than the remainder of the Island and also that usage has reduced and that it is important that the development does not have a negative impact on it by further reducing the use of the language. On the other hand there are positive elements to the development in the form of the 50% affordable housing at Kingsland; mitigations and conditions in the form of apprenticeships for local people which partly derive from the Welsh Language Assessment and which form part of the mitigation measures. There is also as part of Penrhos, an emphasis on the use of the Welsh Language as an attraction to draw visitors to the development – that also stems from the Welsh Language Assessment and is part of the mitigation.

Councillor John Griffith reiterated the thanks for the Officers' work on what has been a complicated process. He said that a number of factors had been put forward to negate each of the proposals for the three sites – AONB; SSSI; green wedge; archaeological and historical remains; loss of habitats; being outside of settlement areas and pressure and demand on local service. He believed however that insufficient emphasis has been given in the conclusions to some of those issues. Councillor Griffith said that in every case where it is highlighted there will be significant harm affecting all three sites, emphasis is again placed on the need to be balanced in terms of the other considerations including economic ones. Even the question of public access to Penrhos comes with a warning that current arrangements for access are permissive and could be withdrawn at any time. Councillor Griffith referred to the fact that the carrot comes in the form of Cae Glas where open space is currently inaccessible. A nature reserve of 38 hectares will be made available together with a visitor centre to provide significant benefit in respect of public access and open space. Councillor Griffith asked how could Members possibly justify relaxing of some of the Authority's policies and rules to permit the approval of three separate sites with different but interrelated developments. He questioned whether Members would be setting a precedent that they will not be able to back down from in future. How could the Planning Committee recommend refusal of a development near an SSSI or an AONB in one part of Anglesey yet approve a development on a much larger scale somewhere else. Councillor Griffith said that he believed that putting all the sites together as one application and permitting the hearing of it with all the other applications before the Committee today was wrong and that consideration should have been given to separating them and to listening to Land and Lakes on a different day. He went on to say that whilst he supported the prospects of increased economic effects on Holyhead and Anglesey he would have to consider his position in deciding other applications brought to the Committee where the same factors apply but on a much lesser scale.

He said that what he was asking for was an explanation of how could the problems with regard to the AONB and other situations be passed over in order to approve such a development as this.

The Chair brought the discussion to a close and invited proposals from the Committee's Members. Councillor Lewis Davies proposed that the application be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation. His proposal of refusal was seconded by Councillor John Griffith.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be approved. His proposal was seconded by Councillor Vaughan Hughes.

In the subsequent vote, Councillors Lewis Davies, John Griffith, Ann Griffith, Victor Hughes and Nicola Roberts voted to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

Councillors Kenneth Hughes and Vaughan Hughes voted to approve the application.

Councillor W.T. Hughes abstained from voting.

The reasons cited for refusing the application where that it constituted over development in the countryside and that it would have a detrimental effect on the AONB.

**It was resolved to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the basis that the application is deemed to constitute over development in the countryside and will have a detrimental effect on the AONB. (Councillors Jeff Evans and Raymond Jones did not vote on the application on account of being Local Members and Councillor Richard Owain Jones did not vote as he had not attended the site visit).**

**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 refusing the application.**

#### **7.4 47LPA966/CC – Outline application for residential development together with the demolition of the former school on land at Ysgol Gynradd Llanddeusant**

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

The Planning Development Manager reminded the Committee that at its meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> September, the Committee resolved to defer determination in order to receive details of any discussions between the Council and the Community Council regarding the proposed disposal of the site. A meeting has been held between the Council and the Community Council but no agreement has been reached and the application remains unchanged from its previous submission. A further letter of objection by the Community Council has been received and is contained in the correspondence file. The Officer said that as regards the material planning considerations, the application is acceptable in policy terms as outlined in the report; the Highway Authority raises no objections to the application subject to conditions and the application is also deemed acceptable by officers from ecological and drainage perspectives. Therefore in terms of planning considerations and land use there is nothing different to report and the recommendation remains one of approval subject to conditions and a Section 106 agreement on affordable housing.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes as a Local Member confirmed that from the perspective of the community of Llanddeusant no positive developments had emerged from discussions held. The Community Council has sent an e-mail to the Planning Department and to Members of the Committee with their observations and they remain concerned especially by the access which they consider to be sub-standard in not meeting Highway requirements i.e. 60metre visibility splay.

The Senior Engineer (Development Control) said that a number of documents to which the Community Council's letter refers do not apply to an application such as this. The Highway Authority has considered the application in the context of the Manual for Streets i.e. streets within a 30mph limit and in line with those guidelines it is permissible to have reduced visibility splay of 43m. In this particular case there is 55m visibility in one direction and over 70m in the other direction. A condition is proposed with regard to ensuring the adequacy of the visibility at the access point and on that basis the Highways Department is satisfied with the proposal.

Councillor Jeff Evans pointed out that given the building was formerly a primary school the presumption must be that the school would have ensured that the access was safe and that there

was adequate visibility. The situation has not changed since the school's closure. Councillor Evans said that the application has been looked at and is within policy parameters and he therefore proposed that the application be approved.

Councillor Victor Hughes said that although he was saddened by the prospect of the loss of the school building he was willing to second Councillor Jeff Evans's proposal of approval.

Councillor John Griffith speaking as Local Member drew the Committee's attention to the letter by the Community Council listing a number of points with regard to this proposal regarding which the Community Council feels it has not received adequate explanation and which Councillor Griffith suggested might warrant a further deferral of the application. The Planning Development Manager said that he was happy to respond to the points; both Planning and Highways Officers have considered the points and a careful assessment has been made. The grounds on which the letter is based will not alter the recommendation. Councillor Griffith proceeded to list the issues raised in the letter which related to access; a lack of consultation with the Built Environment Team; a suggestion as to how the proposal's design might be improved so that it is more acceptable; no structural survey carried out on the existing building; the weight given to the new Joint Plan for Anglesey and Gwynedd; surface water drainage design and related issues. The Planning Development Manager responded to each of the points highlighted and said that the application must be dealt with as has been presented, that weight can only be given to planning policies in force currently and with regard to drainage the opinion of Welsh Water, Natural Resources Wales and of the Authority's Drainage Officers has been sought and all three have confirmed that they are satisfied with the proposal. In the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the view is that drainage matters are in order. Also the application as presented is in outline form.

With regard to the access issue, the Senior Engineer (Development Control) confirmed what he had reported earlier in terms of the guidelines followed.

Councillor Lewis Davies raised the issue of affordable housing and questioned whether it was possible to impose a cap on the price of the houses designated as affordable in order to give people from the locality an opportunity to purchase them.

The Legal Services Manager explained that a standard agreement specifies a percentage of the open market value over and above what the house can be sold for and a clause to that effect will already be contained in the agreement and is negotiated between the applicant and the Authority's Affordable Housing Officer to ensure that that figure corresponds to the circumstances of the application in question.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and subject to the conditions listed in the written report. (Councillors John Griffith and Kenneth Hughes as Local Members did not vote on the application)**

*As the meeting had now been in progress for three hours, 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. Those Members present voted for the meeting to continue.*

## **8 ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS**

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

## **9 AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS**

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

## **10 DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS**

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

## 11 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY COUNCILLORS AND OFFICERS

### 11.1 16C119B – Full application for the erection of a building to provide a workshop and office at Pen yr Orsedd, Engedi

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of the Local Member and because the applicant is related to a Councillor.

Councillor R.G.Parry, OBE addressed the Committee as a Local Member to the effect that the application site is not visible for the A55 as it lies in a valley. The application is for a small workshop to keep tools, garage and other household sundries – there is no storage facility in Pen yr Orsedd at present. The applicant is a young man who is also a carpenter and craftsman and who currently works from the garage of his old home and who specialises in woodwork. His father intends to demolish the garage meaning that the applicant will not subsequently have any place to keep his carpentry tools. The workshop would also allow the applicant to keep his van under cover. Councillor Parry said that he did not consider the proposed building to be large at 10m by 10m by 4m approximately and that if the application was for a double garage then that would have posed no problem. The applicant has been honest regarding his intentions for the building. The applicant cannot afford to rent a unit on an industrial estate and to be able to work in the vicinity of his home would be a great advantage to him. Councillor Parry pointed out that there is a large chicken shed unit in the vicinity and a proposal for a large shed to the left of the application site has been granted permission. There are also a builder's yard and farm with a variety of buildings not far away. The proposed development will not stand out. Councillor Parry said that he thought that there would be reduction in traffic as the applicant would not have to travel to and fro for his work. The applicant does not intend to use the site for sale purposes. He asked the Committee to support the application by a young carpenter who wishes to remain in his community to do his work.

Councillor Victor Hughes asked if the proposed shed would be on the back of the house. Councillor R.G.Parry explained that the proposed building would be located in the garden and will not be attached to the house.

Councillor Jeff Evans remarked that the proposal appeared to be a very large building for a shed and he queried whether its purpose is for the use of a joinery business – if that was so he would be happy to support it as a local business. Councillor Evans highlighted that the report however states that the information provided indicates that the proposed workshop would be used partly for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling house and partly in connection with the applicant's joinery business. He asked therefore whether the development is a shed or an extension to the dwelling and he said that he was trying to imagine what it was for and what it would contain. He said that he was inclined to regard it as a small extension rather than as a shed and he queried why would the applicant need so large a building.

Councillor R.G.Parry explained that the building would contain office space in one corner to keep paperwork and that it would also house bicycles and other household items etc. as well as a carpenter's work bench which takes up some space.

The Planning Development Manager showed the Committee an illustration of the proposed workshop's design and said that what was proposed is a steel building with an office and that the applicant's intention is to relocate his office. The Officer explained that when such a proposal is within the countryside there are specific policies that need to be adhered to – Policy 2 of the Ynys Môn Local Plan requires that on sites outside existing settlements, the Council will permit employment developments only in exceptional circumstances where the applicant has been able to demonstrate specific locational requirements and economic benefits which would justify allowing the proposal. However the argument put forward in this case are personal circumstances which is not compliant with the policy's criteria. Personal circumstances are not considered a material factor in determining the use of land and a decision should not be made on that basis. The Highway Authority is of the view that the road network leading to the site from the main highway is substandard in terms of its width and there are insufficient passing areas with restricted forward visibility and has recommended that there should not be an increase in traffic to the site other than the applicant entering and exiting the site for the purpose of his business. The Officer said that he found it difficult to reconcile the assertion that there would be less traffic in the area with locating a business there. For the reasons given, the recommendation is one of refusal.

Councillor Lewis Davies referred to Policy 2 of the UDP and to the fact that developments such as that proposed by the applicant will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and he said that there are large agricultural sheds in the countryside whereas the workshop proposed is smaller in comparison. He suggested that a condition could be attached to the consent to the effect that the development is for business use only in perpetuity in order to promote industry.

The Planning Development Manager reiterated that the policy prescribes that such developments are permitted in exceptional circumstances only where specific needs have been demonstrated.

Councillor Victor Hughes said that he was saddened by the Planning Authority's stance on the application. He pointed out that every craftsman requires a workshop and that a carpenter requires such a facility more than most in order to work with large pieces of wood. Councillor Hughes said that he had doubts as to whether the policy was right and he pointed out that the applicant had been honest as regards his intentions. Moreover, the applicant might engage an apprentice in future thereby developing the business. Councillor Hughes said that he was therefore uncomfortable with the recommendation.

Councillor Jeff Evans proposed that the application be refused. There was no seconder to the proposal.

Councillor Raymond Jones proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation. Councillor Victor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Councillors Lewis Davies, John Griffith, Victor Hughes, Vaughan Hughes and Raymond Jones voted in favour of the application. Councillor Jeff Evans voted to refuse the application.

The reason given for approving the application was that it safeguards and retains employment in the locality and Anglesey.

**It was resolved to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the basis that it safeguards and retains employment in the locality and Anglesey. (Councillor Nicola Roberts as a Local Member did not vote on the application)**

**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 the application.**

## 12 REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS

### 12.1 12C266N/FR – Full application for the erection of an amenity block at Gallows Point, Beaumaris

The application was reported to the Committee as it is on Council owned land.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be approved and his proposal was seconded by Councillor Richard Owain Jones.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and subject to the conditions listed in the written report. (Councillor Lewis Davies as a Local Member did not vote on the application)**

### 12.2 20C290A/FR/RE – Full application for the proposed cable route and sub-station associated with the Anglesey Skerries Tidal Array at Towyn, Cemaes

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee because part of the site (car park and foreshore) is in Council ownership/control.

Councillor Kenneth Hughes proposed that the application be approved and his proposal was seconded by Councillor Victor Hughes.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and subject to the conditions listed in the written report. (Councillors Richard Owain Jones and W.T.Hughes as Local Members did not vote on the application)**

**12.3 22LPA987/CC – Change of use of land to form an extension to the existing cemetery at St Iestyn’s Church, Llanddona**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is made by the Local Authority.

Councillor Richard Owain Jones proposed that the application be approved and his proposal was seconded by Councillor Nicola Roberts.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer’s recommendation and subject to the conditions listed in the written report. (Councillor Lewis Davies as a Local Member did not vote on the application)**

**12.4 39C541 – Full application for the change of use of existing building from public toilet to private garage at Public Toilets, St George’s Road, Menai Bridge**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as the building is owned by the Council.

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that the Town Council is supportive of the proposal.

Councillor Jeff Evans questioned whether in any other circumstances the erection of a private garage would have been permitted on this site.

Councillor John Griffith sought clarification of why the application is being submitted at this time when the expiry date for the receipt of representations is 16<sup>th</sup> October.

The Planning Development Manager explained that given it is an application in respect of a Council owned building it must be considered within the 8 week statutory time frame. As regards whether or not the application would be permitted in other circumstances the application has to be dealt with as it is presented.

Councillor Lewis Davies proposed that the application be approved. He was seconded by Councillor Nicola Roberts.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer’s recommendation and subject to the conditions listed in the written report.**

**12.5 42C114A – Outline application for the erection of an agricultural dwelling together with the installation of a septic tank at Tai’n Coed, Pentraeth**

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that due to the receipt of a late letter of objection which raises several new factors which need to be incorporated within the Officer’s report, he was recommending that consideration of the application be deferred.

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

**12.6 46C147D – Retrospective application for the use of paddock as a touring caravan site and retention of two containers used as a toilet and shower block, the use of land and retention of hardstanding for the commercial storage of caravans, boats and trailers, the residential use of a single touring caravan and retention of portacabin used as an office together with the replacement of the existing septic tank with a new sewerage treatment plant and soakaway at Tan y Graig, Trearddur Bay**

Councillor Jeff Evans said that he believed it to be in everyone’s interest to undertake a site visit and he suggested that a site visit be carried out in order to better appreciate traffic and access issues with regard to the development. Councillor Raymond Jones supported a site visit.

Councillor Dafydd Rhys Thomas as a Local Member said that the Community Council does have concerns regarding this development and that he supported a site visit.

**It was resolved to undertake a site visit for the reason given.**

**12.7 46C523 – Full application for the demolition of the existing dwelling together with the erection of a replacement dwelling at Bodfair, Ravenspoint Road, Trearddur Bay**

The Planning Development Manager said that the application had been called in by a Local Member and that since then an e-mail had been received from the same Member to the effect that he was now satisfied that the concerns raised have been resolved, that the neighbours are happy, and that the Community Council has no objection to the application.

Councillor Victor Hughes proposed that the application be approved and he was seconded by Councillor Kenneth Hughes.

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

**13 OTHER MATTERS**

**13.1 42C231 – Full application for the erection of 13 new dwellings together with the creation of a new access on land at The Sidings, Pentraeth**

The application is reported to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is a departure from the Local Plan Policy but can be permitted under the Unitary Development Plan.

*Councillor Victor Hughes having declared an interest in this application withdrew from the meeting during the discussion thereon.*

The Development Control Manager reminded Members that they had visited the site and that the Committee at its 4<sup>th</sup> September, 2013 meeting had resolved to approve the application following the expiry of the neighbourhood notifications and subject to no additional matters being raised in any correspondence received. Due to the receipt of further letters, it is considered that the application should again be presented to allow for the inclusion of all points raised. The Officer explained that one new matter was raised in relation to the housing needs of Pentraeth. Consequently the Joint Planning Policy Unit has been consulted on this matter and the Policy Unit has responded with the information that a survey of housing in Pentraeth over the past 10 years shows that far less houses have been developed in the village than might have been expected for a village of that size over the period of the Development Plan. Therefore granting permission to this development would not lead to the over development of housing in the area. There is therefore no reason to refuse the application on that basis.

Councillor Vaughan Hughes informed Members that he had received a request from an objector to present his points of objection to the Committee and that the information had been set out in detail and at length. He asked the Chair for his agreement to put the points across.

The Legal Service Manager advised that unless the Committee wishes to re-open the discussion on the merits of the application, the presentation of the objector's arguments may be in vain.

The Planning Development Manager reminded Members that they had considered a number of factors in arriving at their conclusion at the previous meeting and that nothing had changed since that meeting apart from the receipt of information regarding the number of houses developed in the village during the last 10 years. Therefore, he would expect the Committee to come to the same conclusion as at its last meeting based on the same considerations.

Councillor Jeff Evans said he felt that there had been a great deal of work undertaken with regard to the application including two site visits and he proposed that the application be approved. Councillor John Griffith seconded the proposal.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and subject to the conditions listed in the written report. (Councillors Lewis Davies, Kenneth Hughes, Raymond Jones and Richard Owain Jones did not vote on the application as they had not been present at the site visit)**

**13.2 47LPA969B/CC – Prior notification for the demolition of former dwelling (Bryn Eglwys) at Llwyn yr Arth, Llanbabo**

The Planning Development Manager informed the Committee that it has been determined that the Local Planning Authority's prior approval for the above development was not required and that it constituted permitted development.



**It was resolved to note the information.**

**Councillor W.T.Hughes  
Chair**