

Planning and Orders Committee

Minutes of the hybrid meeting held on 4 June 2025

- PRESENT:** Councillor Ken Taylor (Chair)
Councillor Glyn Haynes (Vice-Chair)
- Councillors Geraint Bebb, Neville Evans, Kenneth P Hughes, T LI Hughes MBE, John Ifan Jones, R LI Jones, Jackie Lewis, Dafydd Roberts and Robin Williams.
- Councillor Nicola Roberts – Portfolio Member for Planning, Public Protection & Climate Change.
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Planning Development Manager (RLJ),
Legal Advisor (BS),
Group Engineer (Development Control and Traffic Management) (AR),
Senior Planning Officer (JR)
Planning Assistant (DPS),
Committee Officer (MEH),
Support Assistant – Democratic Services (CH).
- APOLOGIES:** Councillors Jeff Evans and Alwen P Watkin.
- ALSO PRESENT:** Local Member : Councillors Euryon Morris (for application 7.1);
Derek Owen (for application 12.4)

The Chair extended his best wishes to Councillor Alwen Watkin who is in hospital at present.

The Chair welcomed Councillor Kenneth P Hughes to the meeting as he had replaced Councillor Liz Wood on the Planning and Orders Committee.

1 APOLOGIES

As noted above.

2 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Councillor John Ifan Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest in respect of application 7.3 and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon.

3 MINUTES

The minutes of the following meetings were confirmed as correct :-

- Minutes of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 7 May, 2025;

- Minutes of the Election of Chair and Vice-Chair of the Planning and Orders Committee held on 20 May, 2025.

4 SITE VISITS

The minutes of the Site Visits held on 21 May, 2025 were confirmed as correct, subject to the inclusion of the name of Councillor Dafydd Roberts being included in the list of apologies.

5 PUBLIC SPEAKING

There were no Public Speakers.

6 APPLICATIONS THAT WILL BE DEFERRED

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

7 APPLICATIONS ARISING

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

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member, as it is considered that the development would have a negative visual impact. At its meeting on the 7 May, 2025 the committee resolved to undertake a site visit, and this subsequently took place on 21 May, 2025.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the existing dwelling is a two-storey terraced property located within the development boundary of Moelfre and is also located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal consists of erecting an ancillary annexe to be situated to the rear of the existing dwelling. As was viewed during the site visit, the site has different topographical levels, therefore the site is on an upward gradient from the main road, and the annexe will be situated in an elevated position at the top of the site adjacent to Lôn Ty Powder overlooking the Moelfre coast. There is an extant permission to erect a dwelling on the same footprint as the proposed annexe, which has been safeguarded through a lawful use planning permission in 2023. The annex will be smaller in size than the previously approved application. The proposed development demonstrates high quality design and complements and enhances the character and appearance of the site. It is not considered that the proposal will harm the special qualities of the landscape, the Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, or any neighbouring properties. The extant planning permission for a dwelling has a greater visual impact on the landscape in comparison to the proposed annexe. The Highways Authority has requested that parking arrangements were to be provided due to the annexe proposing 3 bedrooms. These bedrooms would result in 3 additional spaces being created in addition to the 3 existing parking spaces in relation to the existing dwelling and the holiday accommodation associated with the site. Whilst it can be shown that sufficient parking for the proposal can be

accommodated within the curtilage of the site, further details were requested in respect of the usability of the bays. A Swept Pat Analysis was submitted to alleviate the concerns of the Highways Authority, and the information provided was acceptable. Welsh Water have requested a condition stating no surface water shall be allowed to drain directly or indirectly into the public sewerage system. In addition to this condition, another condition will be implemented as part of the decision stating prior to the commencement of work on site, full details of how surface water will be discharged within the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. He further noted that usually surface water matters are the responsibility of SAB, however as Welsh Water has specifically requested that the surface water does not connect to the main sewer a condition of any approval of the application has been imposed to ensure that the information is submitted before any works commence on the site. Whilst it is the responsibility of the SAB, surface water is still a relevant planning consideration. It is considered that the overall design for the proposed scheme complies with the relevant planning policies and the recommendation was of approval of the application.

Councillor Eurn Morris, a Local Member said that he would read out the comments by his fellow Local Member, Councillor Margaret M Roberts as she was unable to attend the meeting and as she was the Member that call-in the application for the Committee's consideration on behalf of the Community Council as it was considered that the proposal would have a negative impact on the village of Moelfre. The statement referred that the buildings and the Old Crown overlooks the sea and is an iconic location. It is of a concern that the Council is ignoring the importance of historical buildings. The annexe will have a detrimental effect on the character of the area. Planning Policy AMG3, paragraph 6.5.1.3 is relevant in respect of this application. It was noted that the roads are narrow leading to the development and building materials that will need to be delivered to the site will have a negative impact of neighbouring residents and will damage the roads which is of a concern. The Old Crown has always been a holiday dwelling and consideration needs to be considered as to why a second dwelling on the site is required. Moelfre has a high density of holiday lets in the area. Councillor Roberts requested the Committee refuse the application.

Councillor Morris expressed his own comments that this proposal will have a significant effect on Lôn Ty Powdr which is unsuitable for large vehicles together with additional traffic movement which will have a negative effect on the local residents in respect of noise pollution and highway safety issues. The width of the road is inadequate for passing spaces and for the safety of walkers. He considered that the proposal is contrary to planning policy PCYFF 4 of the Joint Local Development Plan and Criteria 7 of planning policy PCYFF 2.

The Planning Development Manager responded that extant planning permission for a dwelling exists on the land, therefore the principle of development on the site has been safeguarded. The proposed annexe will have a reduce height of the roof canopy and it is considered that the proposal is an improvement as to what has been previously approved, and the amended design and appearance are considered acceptable given that the proposed

development conforms to the site and built surroundings. He noted that during the site visit it was evident that Lôn Ty Powdr is a narrow road towards the site and the applicant has submitted information to the Highways Authority as regards to parking arrangements and turning points; the Highways Authority requested that a Construction Management Plan is conditioned as part of the decision to ensure that construction and delivery vehicles effectively conform to the scheme due to highway safety. Due to the construction and delivery aspect of the development the Highways Authority consider that the effects on the narrow road would be negligible and will be temporary during construction. He referred to the comments as regards that the dwelling will be for holiday use and noted that it is not a planning consideration as the dwelling is a C3 use until this Council adopts Article 4.

Councillor Robin Williams said that Councillor Margaret M Roberts a Local Member had call-in the application for the Committee's consideration due to the concerns of the Llanallgo Community Council. The Officer's report states that there were no comments by the Community Council. He expressed that every Town/Community Council needs to be aware that they have a right to comment on any planning application. Councillor Williams proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation as there is extant planning permission currently on the site.

Councillor Kenneth P Hughes seconded the proposal of approval of the application.

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

7.2 HHP/2025/7 – Retrospective application for alterations and extensions together with the erection of a balcony at 39 Parc Tyddyn Bach, Holyhead

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member due to concerns of the effect on residential amenity and the intrusion to privacy to neighbouring properties. At its meeting on the 7 May, 2025 the committee resolved to undertake a site visit, and this subsequently took place on 21 May, 2025.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the application is a retrospective application for the retention of a two-storey flat roof rear extension and a balcony positioned on the rear elevation of the extension. Originally a 1.8m privacy screen fencing was proposed between the neighbouring property of 40 Parc Tyddyn Bach. The applicant has submitted revised plans to include obscure glazing on the front of the balcony and a new 1.8m high timber fence along the rear boundary and panels between the boundary of the existing dwelling and the neighbouring property 40 Parc Tyddyn Bach. Whilst the proposal complies with the distances required within the Supplementary Planning Guidance the revised plans is considered an improvement and addresses the concerns of the Members during the site visit. The recommendation was of approval of the application.

Councillor Glyn Haynes and a Local Member said that he still considers that there is an intrusion to the privacy of the neighbouring property. Discussions have been undertaken between the interest parties as regards to the balcony and the applicant has agreed to erect obscure glass on the front of the balcony. He said that he would be abstaining from voting on the application.

The Planning Development Manager said that the applicant has addressed the concerns of the owner of the neighbouring property with the erection of obscure glass on the front of the balcony together with raising the height of the fence to 1.8m., which is considered an improvement.

Councillor Robert LI Jones and a Local Member said that they considered that there will be an intrusion to the neighbouring property due to this application. Councillor Jones proposed that the application be refused contrary to the Officer's recommendation. There was no seconder to the proposal of refusal.

Councillor Jackie Lewis proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation. Councillor John Ifan Jones seconded the proposal of approval.

Councillor Glyn Haynes abstained from voting.

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

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

(Councillor John Ifan Jones declared a personal and prejudicial interest and left the meeting during discussion and voting thereon).

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee at the request of a Local Member and as the Council is responsible for the access track that leads from the B4422 to the site. At its meeting on the 7 May, 2025 the committee resolved to approve the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation. The reasons given for approval of the application was that the proposed design is lesser in scale than the previously refused application and will integrate into the surrounding area and it would be more beneficial to demolish the property than to bring an old house up to modern standards and that the proposed dwelling would provide a home for a local family.

The Planning Development Manager reported that Criteria 7 of planning policy TAI 13 states that outside development boundaries, the siting and design of the total new development should be of a similar scale and size and should not create a visual impact significantly greater than the existing dwelling in order that it can be satisfactorily absorbed or integrated into the landscape.

Paragraph 14.2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance states that replacement dwellings should be no larger than 20% of the floor area of the original unit, however, it is appreciated that this figure is a guide, and that the Local Planning Authority have approved and lost appeals for larger dwellings. The application refused by this Committee in February 2024 proposed a 295% increase in floor area, whilst this application proposes a 198.6% increase in floor area. Whilst it is lesser in scale than the previously refused application, it remains an immense increase in floor area which is considered aspirational. The replacement dwelling would also constitute considerable increase in length, width and height compared to the existing dwelling. The existing dwelling is a simple design, including a pitched slate roof and pebble dashed walls which is not a prominent feature of the landscape. An increase in height of between 1.8m and 2.8m coupled with increases in length and width would lead to the creation of a dwelling with its scale and mass significantly greater than the existing property. The proposed finished materials consist of a mixture of local stone cladding, black windows and doors and metal wall and roof cladding. The increase in scale and design would fail to preserve its open countryside setting, contrary to planning policy PCYFF 3. Whilst erecting a new dwelling could allow for a more modern and sustainable property, the applicant must demonstrate that the existing dwelling is not capable of retention through renovation and extension and/or it is demonstrated that the repair of the existing building is not economically feasible. He noted that he explained at the last meeting that there appears to be no comparison between the submitted structural report and the build costs. The structural report should make recommendations, and the cost comparison should provide the costs of carrying out the recommendations. It is considered that insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the existing dwelling is not capable of retention through renovation and extension, and it has not been demonstrated that the repair of the existing building is not economically feasible. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to criteria 4 of planning policy TAI 13.

The Planning Development Manager further said that providing a home for a local family is not a material planning consideration. The main planning consideration for this application is that the replacement dwelling is not acceptable in terms of scale and design and that the proposal fails to comply with planning policy TAI 13. The recommendation was a refusal of the application as it is contrary to criteria 4 and 7 of TAI 13.

Councillor Nicola Roberts, a Local Member said that the application is for the demolition of an old farmhouse that has no architectural quality to address the needs of the family who wishes to live locally in their community and to use services in the vicinity which she considered a relevant consideration as it will benefit the area economically as the family have employed local people for years in the family business. The intention of the applicants to use local sourced companies and businesses to build the proposed dwelling. She referred to the Supplementary Planning Guidance which states that replacement dwellings should be no larger than 20% of the floor area of the original unit, however, it must be considered that this figure is a guideline, and the Planning Authority have in the past, recommended approval of some applications that are larger than the specified criteria. The applicant's have

been in dialogue with the Planning Officer's to reach a compromise for them to be able to build a home for their family, but no agreement has been reached thus far, even though there has been a decrease to size of the proposed dwelling from 295% to 198% larger than the original dwelling. The proposed new dwelling is a four-bedroom house with only 9m larger in size than the current dwelling which she considered is acceptable and is essential for a modern property. She noted that the scale of the property seems to be a barrier for Officer's to propose approval of the application, but there a similar application approved by appeal, namely in Red Wharf Bay with a property that was 460% greater in size than the original dwelling. She further referred to another three-storey dwelling in Tynyngogl and located 100m from the highway and overlooking neighbouring properties - she read out the reasons for approval within the Officer's report to the Committee. She expressed that this proposal is 900m from any visual position. Councillor Roberts referred to the application at Cae Graham, Pentraeth which was located within an Area of Outstanding Beauty that was approved following appeal – she read out the reasons for approval on appeal to the Committee. Ty Coch is surrounded by different design and sizes of dwellings in Rhostrehwfa with two houses visible from a wide range of viewing points and one property was originally a small cottage which received planning permission for a large two-storey dwelling.

The Planning Development Manager responded to the issues raised and said that considering approval of an application due to a local person could set a precedent and applications should be considered on their planning merits. He appreciated that Paragraph 14.2 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance states that replacement dwellings should be no larger than 20% of the floor area of the original unit is a guide but the Planning Inspectorate refers to the visual effect on the landscape and how it is assessed due to the scale of a property. Whilst the applicant has reduced the scale of the proposed dwelling to 198% larger than the original dwelling it must be noted that it is 10 time larger and a significant size for a four-bedroom dwelling. Whilst appreciating that there have been applications approved on appeal, this application has a public footpath through the site. He made refers to the comments to other dwelling in Rhostrehwfa that is of a substantial scale, but this property was approved before the Local Development Plan was adopted by the Authority. He also noted that the Supplementary Planning Guidance also refers that comparison to other properties should not be considered when dealing with planning applications and planning policies and guidelines needs to be complied with when dealing with such applications.

Councillor Geraint Bebb, and a Local Member continued the statement of his fellow Local Member and said that the barrier for approving this application is the difference of option of Officer's and the applicant business case does not co-insides with their interpretation. The applicant has submitted a Quantity Surveyor's sustainability report, but the Authority's Charter Surveyor has questioned the report. It was noted that Quantity Surveyor's role is specific to managing project costs and Chartered Surveyor role is managing developing land buildings and infrastructure. The challenges faced by the applicant's is that details within the Chartered Surveyor's report have been redacted before sharing the document with the applicants. The figures within the Quantity

Surveyor's report are in accordance with the BCS standards which provides cost and pricing information for construction and the report has referred to six different levels of pricing quartile scales. The applicants have used the low to medium quartile when pricing the costs of construction of the proposed dwelling whilst it will be constructed by the applicants themselves. The Quantity Surveyor has visited the site of Ty Coch whilst the Authority's Chartered Surveyor has not visited the site. He further said that renovation of the current dwelling is not viable, and the applicants have noted that the proposal is of a high-quality design and have addressed mitigating factors. There has been no objection within the community to the development during the consultation period. Councillor Bebb said that he reiterates his comments at the last meeting and proposed that the application be approved contrary to the Officer's recommendation.

The Planning Development Manager responded to the comments made and said that sharing the report of the Chartered Surveyor's is not usual practice with applicants, however, a summary of the report was shared. The Chartered Surveyor considered that the BCS figures afforded seemed to be low due to the scale and design of the proposed dwelling. He noted that Structural Reports identify any deficiencies of any building and thereafter costs comparison is gauged as to the renovation costs and demolition/rebuilding of a new dwelling. The Structural Report submitted by the applicant did not identify these cost comparisons.

Councillor Kenneth P Hughes said that it seems that there is a difference of opinion between the Officer's and the Members of the Committee as to the scale of the proposed dwelling and that it would not have a negative visual effect on the landscape. He said that he disagreed with the comments within the report that proposal by local people is not a material consideration. Affordable dwelling applicants must prove that there is a local need. Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal of approval of the application.

The Planning Development Manager responded to the comments made and said that the affordable home policy is totally different to an application for a private property.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts reiterated his comments at the last meeting that financial viability must be made as regards to the costs of renovating the current dwelling and building a new property. He noted that as the cost comparisons has not been afforded by the applicant, he recommended that the application be refused in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Robert Ll Jones seconded the proposal of refusal of the application.

Councillor Jackie Lewis ascertained as to how the design of the proposed dwelling does not conform to planning policies. The Planning Development Manager responded that the scale of the proposed dwelling will have a visual impact compared to the current dwelling on site. The current dwelling at Ty Coch is a traditional farmhouse and developing a modern large-scale dwelling will have a visual effect.

Following the vote with 5 against the proposal and 5 in support, the casting vote of the Chair was to refuse the application.

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

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 VAR/2025/18 – Application under Section 73 for the variation of condition (02) (sale of non-food goods only) of planning permission reference FPL/2023/18 (Retrospective consent for the sub-division of a single retail unit into 2 separate retail units) so as to allow for the sale of food from Unit 2a at Herron Services, Glanhwfa Road, Llangefni

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

The Planning Development Manager reported that Condition (02) of planning permission reference FPL/2023/18 (condition 13) of the original permission ref 34C72Q/ECON) states that 'The retail units hereby approved shall only be used for the sale of non-food goods and for no other purpose specified in Class A1'. Analysis of planning application 34C72Q/ECON indicates that the permission sought in relation to the retail units was specifically for 'non-food' retail use, and it appears that the condition restricting use was imposed solely on the basis of the applicant's original specification as the Officer's delegated report provides no clear planning or policy justification for restricting the use of the units to non-food retail. Having regard to the fact that no material change of use is proposed, the variation of Condition (02) of planning permission FPL/2023/18, to allow for the sale of food from Unit 2a is therefore considered to be acceptable. The Herron Garage next to the proposed application sells food, and there has been no objections received as regards to the proposal

and the Highways Authority have been consulted and have raised no objection.

Councillor Geraint Bebb and a Local Member said that there are comments on social media and within the Town Council that there are over provision of fast food and hairdressers in Llangefni . He referred that there is already a problem with litter from the Subway fast-food outlet in Herron Garage and approving this application would increase the litter problems. He further said that there is a high volume of traffic entering the Herron garage already and this application would further increase traffic on the Glanhwfa Road. Councillor Bebb proposed that the application be refused contrary to the Officers recommendation as it is contrary to planning conditions MAN 3 and MAN 7.

The Planning Development Manager responded that this is not a change of use application and is still a Class A1 definition. He considered that there is sufficient parking availability in front of the Units on the site and is within the development boundary of Llangefni and is of walking distance from the Town centre. He further said that he did not consider that there will be an increase in traffic that justifies refusing the application and he did not consider that the proposal was contrary to planning conditions MAN 3 and MAN 7.

Councillor Dafydd Roberts expressed that there are take-away/fast-food litter thrown onto the highway and outside these premises. He ascertained whether a condition could be imposed on fast-food outlets to ensure that they contribute towards clearing the litter as the name of the fast-food outlets are on the litter.

The Planning Development Manager responded that placing a condition on fast-food outlets would not be possible. He noted that there will be no seating area within the unit, and it considered that customers will not be eating on site.

Councillor Robin Williams said that the original units on the site were approved for the sale of non-food goods and this application is for the variation of condition (02) (sale of non-food goods only). He noted that there seems to be an increase in applications for variation of conditions as regards to these types of businesses. Councillor Williams said that there is no justification for another fast-food unit in Llangefni. He seconded the proposal of refusing the application.

Councillor Jackie Lewis said that there are currently businesses on this proposed site and proposed that the application be approved. Councillor Kenneth P Hughes seconded the proposal of approval.

Following the vote of 6 for refusing the application and 4 in approval.

It was RESOLVED to refuse the application contrary to the Officer's recommendation as it was deemed that the application was contrary to planning policies MAN 3 and MAN 7.

(In accordance with the requirements of the Constitution the application will be automatically deferred to the next meeting to allow the Officers to respond to the reasons given for approving the application).

12.2 VAR/2024/35 – Application under Section 73 for the variation of condition (02) of planning permission reference FPL/2022/134 (Full application for conversion of the outbuilding into a 2-bedroom holiday let) so as to amend the design at The Tithe Barn, Llangristiolus

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as it is made under Section 73 to vary a permission which was originally granted by the Planning and Orders Committee. In addition, the application was called in by a Local Member due to local concerns together with concerns regarding over provision of holiday accommodation in the area.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the proposed application does not seek to alter the consented use of the building and only seeks to amend the design. As such the principle of the development has already been accepted and is not for contention as part of this application. The main issues of the scheme are the acceptability of the amended design in terms of visual impact and the impact upon the character of the Listed Building. The structure is located within the curtilage of a Listed Building and therefore the design of the scheme is primary consideration in order to ensure the character and distinctiveness of the historic asset is retained. The stone remains of the building will be retained and re-pointed which will appear as a cladding, with dark cladding and sheeting used for the new structures. The design was considered accepted by the Heritage Officer of the Authority as it follows the same general design that was approved by the Committee on the original scheme. The amendments to the scheme are considered to be minimal and would not alter the acceptability of the scheme in terms of design or its impact upon the Listed Building. The recommendation was of approval of the application.

Councillor Geraint Bebb and a Local Member said that whilst there are local concerns as to the over provision of holiday accommodation in the area, this the proposal is an improvement as regards to design of the holiday let. Councillor Bebb proposed that the application be approved in accordance with the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Neville Evans seconded the proposal of approval.

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

12.3 FPL/2023/181 – Full application for the erection of 6 residential units together with associated development at Shire Hall, Glanhwfa Road, Llangefni

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the applicant has failed to complete and sign a S106 agreement. The Planning and Orders Committee approved the application at its meeting held on 9 July, 2024.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the developer has requested that the application be deferred to allow further time to progress the S106 legal agreement. He noted that a deferment of the application until next meeting can be considered but if there is no progress the application will have to be referred to the Committee to be reviewed.

Councillor Robin Williams proposed that the application be deferred to the next meeting. Councillor Geraint Bebb seconded the proposal of deferment.

It was RESOLVED to defer the application in accordance with the applicant's request to allow for further time to progress the S106 legal agreement.

12.4 FPL/2025/84 – Application for refurbishment and alterations together with associated landscape works at the former Marine Terminal Building, Amlwch Port, Amlwch

The application was presented to the Planning and Orders Committee as the application is submitted by the Isle of Anglesey County Council.

The Planning Development Manager reported that the proposed development comprises the refurbishment of the Marine Terminal Building which is a two-storey workshop, stores and office building located on the southern shore of Amlwch Port to the south of the Grade II listed Dry Dock, and to the east of the Grade II Sail Loft, in a coastal landscape setting of Amlwch Port. The proposal involves the refurbishment and extension of the existing building, along with associated landscaping and biodiversity enhancement. No material change of use is proposed. The proposal will deliver significant visual and environmental improvements to the building and site and is therefore considered to be acceptable in terms of layout, design and appearance which will complement, preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the site. The recommendation was of approval of the application.

Councillor Derek Owen, a Local Member said that the proposal is acceptable and will afford improvements to the building.

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

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

13 OTHER MATTERS

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

**COUNCILLOR KEN TAYLOR
CHAIR**