

# PLANNING AND ORDERS COMMITTEE

## Minutes of the hybrid meeting held on 6 March, 2024

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Councillor Ken Taylor (Chair) Councillor Glyn Haynes (Vice-Chair)  Councillors Geraint Bebb, Jeff Evans, Neville Evans, John I. Jones, Trefor Lloyd Hughes, MBE, Robert Ll. Jones, Dafydd Roberts, Alwen Watkin, Robin Williams, Liz Wood.  Local Members: Councillor Margaret M. Roberts and Ieuan Williams (for application 7.2)
<b>IN ATTENDANCE:</b>	Planning Development Manager (RLJ) Group Engineer (Development Control and Traffic Management (AR) Legal Services Manager (RJ) Committee Officer (ATH) Democratic Services Support Assistant (CH)
<b>APOLOGIES:</b>	Councillor Jackie Lewis, Councillor Nicola Roberts (Portfolio Member for Planning, Public Protection and Climate Change)
<b>ALSO PRESENT:</b>	Councillor Derek Owen, Owain Rowlands (Planning Officer) David C. Parr-Sturgess (Planning Assistant).

---

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Jackie Lewis and Councillor Nicola Roberts (Portfolio Member for Planning, Public Protection and Climate Change).

### 2. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

No declaration of interest was received.

### 3. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 7 February, 2024 were presented and were confirmed as correct.

### 4. SITE VISITS

The minutes of the Planning site visit held on 21 February, 2024 were presented and were confirmed as correct.

The Chair referred to the low attendance at the site visit on 21 February which was disappointing with four Members present and four having tendered their apologies for absence in advance meaning that five were absent without notice. He reminded Members that physical site visits are convened by decision of the Committee and are important, and he therefore believed Members have a duty to make every effort to attend. Although he appreciated that that is not always possible, he highlighted that planning site visits are held to a known schedule two weeks after the Committee meeting, thereby allowing Members if

they can, to rearrange their diary accordingly. In the event that Members are unable to attend a site visit, he respectfully asked them to give notice of their absence beforehand.

## **5. PUBLIC SPEAKING**

There were two Public Speakers in relation to application 7.1 on the agenda.

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

### **6.1 FPL/2023/61 – Full application for the change of use of agricultural land into holiday lodge site, siting 13 holiday lodges, construction of new road on site, alterations to existing vehicular access together with soft and hard landscaping on land at Taldrwst, Lôn Fain, Dwyran**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At its meeting held on 1 November, 2023 the Committee resolved to conduct a site visit which subsequently took place on 15 November, 2023. At its meeting held on 6 December 2023, the Committee resolved to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation on the basis that insufficient drainage information had been provided to allow Members to make a decision.

The Planning Development Manager reported that although surface water matters are outside the remit of the planning process, the developer has agreed to provide this information for the Committee's benefit in order that a decision can be made. The developer has submitted a SuDS application to the Local Authority as the SuDS approval body and that information is currently being assessed. This being so, it is the Officer's recommendation that the application be deferred to allow the information to be fully assessed and a decision on the SuDS application made.

Councillor John I. Jones proposed, seconded by Councillor Liz Wood that the application be deferred in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

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

## **7. APPLICATIONS ARISING**

### **7.1 FPL/2023/176 – Full application for the demolition of 2 outbuildings together with the erection of 2 affordable dwellings, 4 open market dwellings with the creation of a new vehicular access on land to the rear of the Post Office, Holyhead Road, Gwalchmai**

The application was reported to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member amid concerns regarding the new access onto the A5 and the ability of the public sewerage network to accommodate additional flows. At its meeting held on 7 February 2024 the Committee resolved to conduct a physical site visit which was held on the 21 February, 2024.

#### *Public Speakers*

Mr Oswyn Williams spoke **as an objector** to the application on behalf of Gwalchmai residents who were opposed to the application as was the Community Council.

Mr Williams referred to a lack of clarity regarding the status of the proposed dwellings and whether they will be affordable units, open market properties or market rented properties. The access to the application site is a particular cause for concern and is thought to be

unsuitable and potentially hazardous leading out as it does to the A5 in a busy location where cars, HGVs, tractors, and trailers park daily to use the nearby shop and post. The residents of the terrace houses opposite have to park their cars on the A5 close to the access to the development. This has not been given due attention by the Highways Department which refers to onsite parking but not parking on the A5 itself which obstructs visibility leading onto this busy highway.

The information provided at section 21 of the application form is inaccurate in that there is a water ditch on the boundary less than 20 metres from the proposed development. Water collects in this area due to surface water and a blockage in the ditch in January this year caused the manhole on the road to Pentreuchaf to overflow. The addition of further hardstanding areas will exacerbate the situation and create more flooding in this area and in the village. There has been regular correspondence between the Planning Department and interested parties in the past month expressing concern regarding this issue. Another source of concern are sewerage related issues especially around the Pant area of the village with there being visual evidence of raw sewerage around houses and overflows from manholes with the situation having deteriorated following further development and its connection to the fragile infrastructure.

Mr Williams also spoke about the potential impact of the proposal on the Welsh language with no reference being made to policies for promoting the language or Welsh Government targets. No mention is made either of how asbestos in the storehouse situated close to the pavement will be dealt with safely when it is demolished. The removal of a boundary hedge which does not belong to the developer would affect wildlife, and allowing twelve upper floor windows to overlook would affect the privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties.

Mr Jamie Bradshaw of Owen Devenport spoke **in support** of the application confirming that the proposal is for six dwellings, two of which will be affordable on under-used brownfield site in the centre of Gwalchmai. The proposal will provide affordable, lower cost homes that will meet the needs of the community in a highly accessible location, is of good design that complements its setting and will provide ecology mitigation and enhancement to address its modest impacts. The proposal is a prime example of the type of development supported by national and local policy. The proposal would also provide a new entrance and put in place 45 metre visibility splays which is that for 30mph roads rather than the 22 metres required for the current 20mph limit. It would generate 2 to 3 movements within the morning and afternoon peak hours which is well within the capacity of the road, and there would be a good level of off-road parking and turning space.

A good mix of housing is proposed with 4 2-bedroom houses and 2 3-bedroom houses with their size and design meaning that the open market houses will be low cost and so within reach of local couples and families. A detailed Housing Mix Assessment has been submitted which shows there is considerable need for this type of housing locally supported by a survey where 22 of the 23 responses were from local residents. This report was examined by the Council's Housing Officers who agreed with its conclusions. Similarly a Welsh Language Impact Assessment has been provided and accepted by the Council's Officers.

With regard to drainage, whilst there is a concern locally about the capacity of sewers, Dŵr Cymru has assessed the scheme and has concluded that there is capacity to cater for the proposal. In relation to tree removal, the proposal only requires the removal of two trees and one small group which are lower grade. New trees are proposed to replace them. Whilst a neighbour claims that some of these are on their land, of those only group two are set for removal, and this is on the other side of the boundary wall. As such no trees would be removed on the neighbour's land.

The proposal complies with the Local Development Plan, is fully supported by the Officers and provides a good mix of high- quality homes that will be low cost and so will help to address the impact of the housing crisis on the village.

The Planning Development Manger reported that Gwalchmai is identified as a Service Village under the provisions of the Joint Local Development Plan and as such new housing in the settlement is considered under policy TAI 3 which supports the creation of new residential units in Service Villages subject to capacity within the indicative provision level of housing. Although the report shows that the proposed development would exceed the indicative provision on windfall sites in Gwalchmai, data provided by the Housing Service in relation to waiting lists indicates that there is a substantial demand for 2 and 3 bed dwellings in the Gwalchmai area. As the development consists of 2 and 3 bed dwellings, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that it is justified and corresponds with local housing needs. The proposal also includes 2 affordable units in line with the requirements of Policy TAI 15.

The Planning Development Manager referred to the issues of concern raised locally with highway matters being the principal source of concern along with drainage and flooding and the Welsh language. One of the main issues raised is the impact of the new access on parking in reducing the ability of residents and users of the shop to park on the road thereby exacerbating existing parking problems and highway safety. The proposed new access is situated approximately 35 metres away from the shop and it is not considered reasonable to refuse the application on the basis of a need for occasional parking in order to use the shop. It might be argued that the new access will improve the parking situation by reducing the number of vehicles parked on the highway thereby leading to better traffic flow and highway safety through the village. The scheme includes 14 off road parking spaces and does not directly add to the existing parking issues; neither is it for the development to resolve existing parking issues. The Highways Service has confirmed that the proposal is acceptable and complies with the requirements for parking provision and visibility splays. It is difficult to see how one access shared by six properties 35m away from the shop will create more problems than the current seven accesses which are within 120m to the shop. With regard to drainage and sewerage issues, Dŵr Cymru as the sewerage undertaker has raised no concerns about the capacity of the network to accommodate the proposed dwellings. Dŵr Cymru did however express concern about the proximity of the proposal to the public sewer and this is addressed by condition (12) which requires the submission of a public sewer diversion scheme before any development takes place. Although concerns have been raised regarding blockages in the system, this does not mean that the system lacks capacity and is not a reason for refusing the application. As the development is not within the flood zone which extends over 140m south of the application site boundary, NRW has raised no objections. Although a small water ditch runs to the rear of the site it is not within the application site and no water is discharged directly to the ditch. NRW's flood map for Planning although it has no official status, shows that the land between the property to the rear and the ditch lies within Zone 3 for surface water and small water courses but the ditch itself does not lie within this zone. These matters will be addressed as part of the SAB approval process which is separate from the planning process. A Welsh Language Impact Assessment accompanying the application is considered acceptable by the Council's Welsh Language and Policy Manager based on the small scale of the proposal and because it meets local demand for housing and for affordable low-cost units. With regard to other issues, the Council's Ecology Advisor is satisfied with the measures proposed to safeguard the ecological features of the site including the boundary hedge; the proposal conforms with distance requirements set out in the SPG Design Guide and it is not considered that any negative impacts will arise therefrom. The issue of asbestos would be dealt with under the relevant legislation and is not a planning matter. As regards affordability, Planning Policy Wales states that any dwelling not defined as an affordable dwelling is an open market dwelling i.e. a private dwelling for sale or for rent. The developer has also updated the planning application form to reflect the fact that the proposal is within 20m of a water course.

Having considered the scheme against all relevant policies and supplementary planning guidance, no reasons for refusal have been identified and no other material considerations are present that indicate a decision other than approval is justified. It is therefore the Officer's recommendation that the application be approved subject to the planning conditions outlined and a Section 106 agreement with regard to the provision of the affordable dwellings.

Councillor Neville Evans spoke as a Local Member and a member of the Trewalchmai Community Council and he repeated the concerns voiced by Mrs Oswyn Williams in his address to the Committee regarding the access to the development and the challenges that that might create in terms of traffic generation and parking on an already busy road. He referred to longstanding issues in relation to sewerage, drainage and flooding which have deteriorated with recent heavy rains and housing development within the village. He said that he had been called out several times this winter because of problems with flooding and overflowing which were thought to be due to the system being old and unable to cope. He was surprised that neither Dŵr Cymru nor the Council had any comments to make regarding the situation. He questioned the idea of affordability and whether the proposed dwellings would be affordable for local people even those designated as such, and he also raised concerns about developers being granted planning permission in Gwalchmai and elsewhere on the basis of providing affordable homes and then seeking to withdraw the affordable provision later. The impact of open market estates on small Welsh villages such as Gwalchmai and the Welsh language is becoming increasingly apparent. Councillor Evans said that he had wanted to show the Committee some photographs to illustrate technical planning matters in relation to highway and flooding issues and was disappointed that the request had been declined and although he respected the Officer and Chair's decision in this regard, he thought there needed to be greater clarity around which requests to show photographs are allowed and which are not, given that a similar request had been allowed at the last meeting.

The Planning Development Manager said that many of the issues raised by the Local Member had been addressed in his presentation and he reiterated that notwithstanding the road is busy, the shop is some distance away from the application site, Dŵr Cymru as the professional body and statutory consultee has no concerns regarding the capacity of the network to accommodate the development and the condition regarding diverting the public sewer crossing the site may provide an opportunity to improve the situation. The ditch and surface water issues are a matter for the SAB approval process and affordability means under market value.

Councillors R. Llewelyn Jones and Jeff Evans referred to the need for housing across Anglesey particularly low-cost affordable housing and accepted the assessment by the Housing Service of there being substantial demand for 2 and 3 bed dwellings in the Gwalchmai area. Councillor Jones asked about the carbon emissions in building the homes. Councillor Evans said that it was difficult to understand what affordable means with regard to housing without there being a value or figure attached. He noted that Dŵr Cymru was satisfied with drainage arrangements and saw no reason for not approving the proposal.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts queried whether the new diverted public sewer would be tested to ensure it is structurally sound and in working order.

Councillor John I Jones said that he understood that the two proposed affordable dwellings would be 2 rather than 3-bedroom properties and he questioned whether they would benefit or be attractive to families which is what the area needs. He asked about education provision and whether the Learning Service had required a contribution from the developer and he expressed some dissatisfaction with the location and design of the proposed development

thinking that it was being squeezed into its location and that it raises privacy issues with regard to neighbouring properties. For those reasons, he proposed that the application be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Neville Evans.

The Planning Development Manager advised in response to the points raised by the Committee that whilst it is not possible to monitor the carbon emissions of individual dwellings, new housing is built to high specifications in terms of sustainability and carbon neutrality and a carbon management plan is required for large scale development. With regard to the diversion of the public sewer, Dŵr Cymru would assess the structure for soundness and for compliance with its own requirements and the provision of a new sewer pipe might present an opportunity for improving the drainage situation in the area. In relation to affordability, as every area is different as regards the factors that affect affordability it is not possible to provide a universal figure that comprises every area. An affordable home is a home that is for sale at 20% to 30% below the market value for housing in a given area. The Planning Development Manager confirmed that the Learning Service had not required a contribution from the developer with regard to school places. He further advised that the scheme is considered acceptably designed, that it fits in with its surroundings and conforms with the distance requirements specified in the SPG Design Guide. As the site is set back and is at a lower level than the highway, the development will not be prominent in the street scene.

Councillor Jeff Evans proposed, seconded by Councillor R. Llewelyn Jones that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. In the ensuing vote the proposal to approve the application was carried.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report subject to the planning conditions set out therein and subject also to a Section 106 agreement to secure the provision of the affordable dwellings.**

## **7.2 FPL/2023/146 – Full application for the demolition of the existing dwelling and erection of a new dwelling together with associated works at Cae Graham, Pentraeth**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member. At its meeting held on 1 February 2024 the Committee resolved to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation the reasons being the proposed dwelling is not on the same footprint as the existing dwelling, the size of the proposed replacement at approximately 50% greater than the existing dwelling exceeds the 20% maximum cited in the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) Replacement Dwellings and Conversions in the Countryside, and the proposed dwelling would have a detrimental impact on designated Dark Skies.

The Planning Development Manager addressed the reasons for refusing the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation advising that the existing dwelling was granted a Certificate of Lawfulness for use as a Class C3 residential dwelling in 2016 and so the proposed dwelling is not a replacement for a caravan or holiday chalet that has legal residential status. The Officer acknowledging that this might be difficult for someone outside the planning process to understand referred to the criteria under Policy TAI 13 which proposals for the replacement of a dwelling must meet, specifically criterion 5 which states that outside development boundaries, the proposed dwelling should not be a replacement for a caravan or holiday chalet that has legal residential status. The Officer explained that it is possible for someone to apply for a lawful use certificate for residential use of a caravan or holiday chalet providing they can provide evidence that it has been lived in and used for this purpose continually for a period of 10 years or more. This would allow them to live lawfully in

the caravan/holiday chalet without the Council taking enforcement action against them. Criterion 5 is designed to ensure that a holiday unit that has been granted a lawful certificate for residential use is not eligible for a new dwelling. This is not the case in Cae Graham where the unit has been built and used solely as a residential unit in the period leading to the granting of the lawful use certificate, namely from 2009 to 2016 which means that the change of use is not one from holiday to permanent residential use. Consequently the applicant has only to demonstrate permanent use of the unit as a residential dwelling for 4 years or more rather than the 10 years required for change of use. The residential use of the unit has been proven and a certificate of lawful use for Class C3 residential use has been granted rather than a certificate for the present use of holiday accommodation as a residential dwelling. The fact that the unit is constructed of wood and resembles a chalet does not make it a holiday chalet and the unit is too large to fall within the definition in the Caravan Act. Additionally, a Certificate of Lawful Use is based on evidence and makes no reference to policy.

With regard to the reasons given for refusing the application, whilst the proposed replacement dwelling would not be precisely in the same location as the existing dwelling, there would be some overlap of the building footprints which would ensure that the existing dwelling would need to be demolished for the replacement dwelling to be erected. Its siting on slightly lower ground would serve to lessen its visual impact and consequently it is not considered that it would give rise to unacceptable landscape or visual impact on the designated AONB or the amenities of adjoining uses. In terms of size, guidance contained in the SPG states that where justification has been received which would mean that the floor area would need to be larger than that of the original building, this addition should be no larger than 20% of the floor area of the original unit. It notes that this figure is not a target to be achieved and that every application should be assessed individually according to merit. The SPG also states that if the replacement building is on a larger scale than the original but would not have a significantly greater visual impact then the proposal would conform with the principles of Policy TAI 13. Although the proposal is for a dwelling with a floor area some 50% larger than that of the existing dwelling, is it of a high-quality design and the use of dark natural materials along with appropriate landscaping would represent an improvement on the existing development and integrate well into the landscape. Being nestled into the hillside and well screened by existing tree and topography it would not result in a significantly greater or unacceptable visual impact on the character and appearance of the area or the AONB. In response to comments by the Ecological Advisor regarding potential light pollution, a lighting splay plan has been submitted which includes mitigation measures to ensure that there will be no impact on wildlife or the Dark Skies and this is considered satisfactory. A condition requiring details of any external lighting would also be attached to any permission. The proposal is considered acceptable and the Officer's recommendation remains one of approval.

Councillor Margaret N. Roberts, a Local Member highlighted that since last month's Committee meeting it has emerged that the hut which is the subject of the application was removed from the Indefatigable in 1995 upon its closure and was used as a chicken hut in Bryn Hyrddin Farm before being removed to its existing location in 2005. She said that the structure has gone through many forms and uses including as a chalet and Airbnb in 2015 but never a dwelling and definitely not a two-storey house with a tower. She referred to criterion 5 of Policy TAI 13 which she quoted and was clear on this point and she emphasised the need for consistency asking the Committee to keep to its previous decision of refusing the application.

Councillor Ieuan Williams, also a Local Member also referred to criterion 5 of Policy TAI 13 and to photographs which were shown to the Committee at its previous meeting. He highlighted that the Architect in the location plan calls the structure "a chalet" Furthermore, the SPG states that "it's noted that applications for demolition and replacement are only

relevant to permanent units. Applications to replace a caravan/chalet with a permanent residential unit are not eligible in accordance with criterion 5 of Policy TAI 13.” The Officer in his presentation to the Committee at its meeting last month describes the structure as a timber framed construction stating that such buildings have a limited lifespan which means that it is not permanent and is therefore contrary to the SPG. The structural survey also confirms that the structure is not permanent. Councillor Williams believed that in order to interpret a policy or rule one has to go back to the intention of the author. In this case that means going back to the draft 2015 policy which states that “outside development boundaries the proposed dwelling is not a replacement for temporary residential accommodation or a building constructed of short life materials. This policy will not permit the replacement of a temporary residential accommodation such as caravans, chalets etc. or buildings constructed from short life materials such as prefabricated houses.” The structure which is the subject of the application is a chalet with lawful residential use – an old hut from Indefatigable which was also a chicken hut from Bryn Hyrddin farm before its removal to its present site. Councillor Williams thought it clear that the Officer’s recommendation was contrary to criterion 5 of Policy TAI 13 and that the application should be refused for that reason.

The Planning Development Manager said that he had given an overview of the interpretation of the policy and the legislation with regard to the Certificate of Lawful Use and that it is a fact that the structure has lawful residential Class 3 use. In describing the structure as having a limited lifespan and not being a permanent structure at last month’s meeting, the Officer clarified that he was quoting from the structural survey accompanying the application which led to the conclusion that renovating and retaining the structure was not economically feasible and that replacing it would be a more appropriate and long-term solution. With regard to the draft policy from 2015, Planning Officers have to work with current policy and legislation.

The Legal Services Manager advised that if the Committee is still minded to refuse the application it must judge the application on its planning merits. He informed the Committee that a challenge to the Certificate of Lawful Use had been received and evidence presented by individuals who assert that the Certificate was not valid to be granted. Notwithstanding, the certificate of lawful use stands for the purpose of this meeting as there is a legal process to be followed in that case which allows the landowner to see the evidence for challenging the certificate before the Planning Officers come to a decision on the matter. The Legal Services Manager referred to the context and background to the granting of the Certificate of Lawful Use which leads to the circumstances in which criterion 5 in Policy TAI 13 applies. At its February meeting, the Committee heard challenges to the Certificate of Lawful Use on the basis of there being no evidence of residential use, the process being defective and a discrepancy between the place name on the application and the name by which the place is known to people locally (the Legal Services Manager explained that he had examined the evidence and provided Planning Officers with advice to make the decision they had made with regard to granting the Certificate of Lawful Use in 2015/16 and was declaring an interest on that basis). Both the applicant and tenant made a sworn declaration at the time and photographs of the structure and site were provided and show that regardless of its origin, the structure was a wooden building at the time of the application in 2015. The application stated that the structure had undergone works to bring it to the condition in which it was in at that time. Furthermore, a note from a site visit by a Planning Officer in November 2015 states that “when visited, car outside and clear signs the property was being used as a dwelling.” A challenge has also been made on the grounds that the application was not advertised. However, a notice was posted on the road to the site, the nearest neighbour was sent a notification as were the Local Members and the Community Council with the only response being from the Community Council which stated that it had no comments on the application. The process followed is therefore undisputable and the Certificate of Lawful Use was consequently granted. Although claims have been made of the chalet being used as

holiday chalet around 2018, there is no record of any complaint to the Council's Enforcement Section at that time. Objections have only been raised upon the submission of a planning application with no complaints having been made in the eight years of usage prior to that. The chalet was sold for £189k in 2016 which is the price of a dwelling which is the status conferred on the chalet by the Certificate of Lawful Use and which allows the chalet to be used unconditionally as a dwelling. This brings the Committee to Policy TAI 13 against which the proposal must be judged on its merits.

Councillor John I Jones although he was sympathetic to the Local Members' concerns thought that because a Certificate of Lawful Use for residential use Class 3 had been granted, a refusal could not be justified and he therefore proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Liz Wood.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts proposed that the Committee's previous decision to refuse the application be reaffirmed on the basis that the proposal for a two-storey dwelling and tower is on a greater scale and size than the existing chalet thereby creating a visual impact greater than the existing structure contrary to criterion 7 of Policy TAI 13. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Alwen Watkin. In the ensuing vote the proposal to reaffirm the Committee's previous decision of refusal was carried.

**It was resolved to reaffirm the Committee's previous decision to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation for the reason given.**

## **8. ECONOMIC APPLICATIONS**

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

## **9. AFFORDABLE HOUSING APPLICATIONS**

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

## **10. DEPARTURE APPLICATIONS**

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

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

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

## **12. REMAINDER OF APPLICATIONS**

### **12.1 DIS/2024/1 – Application to discharge conditions (09) (Construction Management Plan) and (10) (Construction Environmental Management Plan) of planning permission FPL/2023/42 (demolition of the existing dwelling together with the erection of two new dwellings) at Treiddon, Beach Road, Menai Bridge**

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is to discharge conditions imposed by the Committee in determining planning application reference FPL/2023/42 "Full application for the demolition of the existing dwelling together with the erection of two new dwellings at Treiddon, Menai Bridge" at its meeting on 6 December 2023.

The Planning Development Manager reported that condition (09) requires the submission and approval of a Construction Management Plan (CTMP) and condition (10) requires the submission and approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Information pursuant to the above conditions has been submitted to the Local Planning

Authority and following consultation with the Highways Department and the Ecological Advisor, revisions have been made to the document to address issues raised by both consultees. Both consultees have subsequently confirmed that the information submitted is acceptable and meets the requirements of the conditions such that they may be discharged.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor John I. Jones that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

**It was resolved to approve the application in accordance with the Officer's recommendation and report and that conditions (09) and (10) are thereby discharged.**

### **13. OTHER MATTERS**

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

**Councillor Ken Taylor  
Chair**