



CYNGOR SIR
YNYS MÔN
ISLE OF ANGLESEY
COUNTY COUNCIL

Gwasanaeth Democraidd
Democratic Service
Swyddfa'r Cyngor
CAERNARFON
Gwynedd
LL55 1SH

JOINT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN PANEL

Minutes of the Panel's meeting held on **16th May 2014**
Committee Room 1, Llangefni

Present: Gwynedd Council

Cllr. John Brynmor Hughes
Cllr. John Pughe Roberts
Cllr. John Wyn Williams
Cllr. Owain Williams

Isle of Anglesey County Council

Cllr. Lewis Davies
Cllr. Ann Griffith
Cllr. Victor Hughes
Cllr. William Thomas Hughes
Cllr. Nicola Roberts

Officers:

Gareth Jones	Environmental & Planning Service Manager (GC)
Jim Woodcock	Head of Planning & Public Protection (IOACC)
Nia Davies	Manager - JPPU
Heledd Fflur Jones	Team Leader Business & Economy - JPPU
Eirian Harris	Planning Support Assistant – JPPU

Apologies: Cllr. Gethin Glyn Williams (GC)
Cllr. Gwen Griffith (GC)
Cllr. Dyfrig Jones (GC)
Cllr. Dafydd Meurig (substitute –GC)
Cllr. Kenneth Hughes (IOACC)
Cllr. John Arwel Roberts (IOACC)

1) APOLOGIES

As noted above.

2) DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

No declarations of personal interest were received from any members present.

3) URGENT MATTERS

No urgent business was presented.

Cllr. Ann Griffith agreed to Chair the meeting in the absence of Cllr. John Arwel Roberts.

4) MINUTES

Minutes from the Panel meeting held on 25th April, 2014 were accepted as correct.

5) REVIEW OF THE JOINT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN'S STRATEGIC AND DETAILED POLICIES:

A report was presented by Heledd Fflur Jones outlining the amended versions of the Strategic Policies which lead from comments received during the public consultation period about the Preferred Strategy. The Panel's opinion was sought about changes to PS8, PS9 and PS15, and about the series of draft detailed policies before obtaining comments from stakeholders and reporting to Anglesey's Executive Committee and Gwynedd Council's Cabinet, and also to the Joint Planning Policy Committee.

APPENDIX A: PS8 – PROVIDING OPPORTUNITY FOR A FLOURISHING ECONOMY AND THE ASSOCIATED DETAILED POLICIES

PS8 protects land for employment and small business that will benefit from being located on industrial estates. The relevant changes have been made in line with the consultation. The draft wording for a series of detailed policies that support the Strategic Policy was presented. These are the policies;

CYF 1: Protecting land and units for employment use

CYF 2: Ancillary uses on employment sites

CYF 3: New industrial / business units for individual sites on sites which are not protected for employment purposes.

CYF 4: Alternative uses of employment sites

CYF 5: Reuse and Conversion of Rural Buildings for Residential or Business Use

CYF 6: Employment in Local Service Centres or Villages

CYF 7: Agricultural Diversification

CYF 8: Regeneration Sites

Points that arose:

- An enquiry was made regarding growth in areas like Pwllheli and Porthmadog – small businesses are important to these areas. Small businesses need to be supported.
- It was noted that the former Lairds site is not included in CYF 1: Protecting Land and Units for Employment Use. Discussions on its future have taken place with the owners.
- The issue of broadband was raised; need to ensure that this infrastructure is in place in order to support businesses, especially in deprived areas in order to create opportunities and support for small businesses.
- Need flexibility where small businesses are concerned in case policies prevent them from locating in specific locations, e.g. within villages, and that development is not prevented.
- Whilst agreeing that small businesses are important the impact on residential amenity needs to be considered, e.g. if they are located in residential areas

- It is noted that Bryn Cegin is an empty site and Parc Menai is classed as a mixed site. We need policies that will make a real difference, promoting development that will spur other development on sites.

Officers' response:

- There is a series of detailed policies that will provide opportunities for small businesses in appropriate locations within or adjoining settlements.
- Following the employment land study a leisure use seems to be a more appropriate use for the former Lairds site.
- Explanation was given that employment land will not be designated as in the past. We recognise that the world is moving on and needs are different – Cyf 4 facilitate to achieve a preferable land use.
- It was explained that Cyf 3 safeguards land for B1, B2 and B8 uses. Cyf 4 recognises that circumstances may occasionally mean, e.g. where a site has remained vacant for a long time or that the existing buildings are not suitable for modern day businesses, where an element of flexibility is required. In exceptional circumstances alternative uses could be promoted on the site. It was explained that evidence would be required that retaining the existing use isn't viable and that the alternative use is suitable for the site, conforming to relevant policies in the Plan.

APPENDIX B: THE VISITOR ECONOMY

PS9 recognises the importance of the tourism industry within the Plan area, not only for its visitors' attractions and accommodation but indirect effects on local businesses. This is a list of the detailed policies that support the Strategic Policy:

TWR/1: Visitor Attractions and Facilities

TWR/2: Holiday Accommodation

TWR/3: Static Caravan and Chalet Sites

TWR/4: Holiday Occupancy

TWR/5: Touring Caravan and Camping Sites

TWR/6: Alternative Camping Accommodation

Points that arose:

- Need to manage the use made of holiday accommodation as a number of units are used for residential purposes.
- It is possible to have guidelines which will regulate the number of caravans on sites, - have smaller sites instead of large expanding sites?
- It was suggested that instead of proving excess in numbers, that a need should be proven.
- Regarding the excess of caravans, is it possible to prevent two sites adjoining by reviewing the wording.
- It was noted that Policy TWR/4 refers to accommodation being suitable to live in therefore the wording needs to be reviewed to prevent this.
- Reference was made to the fact there are no resources to regulate sites, therefore, it was suggested placing the onus for this with the owners should be explored, i.e. owners should show how they will deal with this. There are examples of large companies dealing with this issue.
- Can conditions be place to regulate the problem of long term occupancy? A signed charter?
- It was suggested that TWR/3 is complicated. Its subdivision into individual policies may make it easier to follow.
- It was suggested that ...'local community'... to be inserted in TWR/4: 4).
- TWR/6 is much more restrictive than TWR/5. From one perspective it was suggested that by design 'yurts' are more like static caravans. It was felt that it is unfair to compare them to touring caravans.

- On the other hand some members of the Panel suggested that they were similar to touring caravans as it is an alternative type of accommodation that can be dismantled at the end of the holiday season. It was suggested they would not be robust enough to withstand the winter season.
- It was suggested that specific sites would be required and that measures were required in order to ensure that they do not lead to permanent sites in the future. On the other hand it was noted that TWR/6 refers to 'small scale' development but that there is no reference to scale when referring to new caravan sites.

Officers' response:

- It was agreed that a cross-reference to Policy TWR/4 that restricts the use of self-catering accommodation to holiday use is required.
- It was agreed that criterion 1b needs to be reworded to refer to a need for caravan sites as opposed to providing an over supply.
- In respect of managing the size of caravan sites the explanation to the proposed policy refers to a 10% increase in the number of units.
- It was agreed that TWR/3 is complicated and its simplification will be explored or its subdivision to more than one policy
- Regarding occupancy rates it's not possible to require owners to manage this. But there is an opportunity for officers at an application stage to request details on how they will deal with long term occupancy of caravans.
- It was agreed that a reference to the impact on community amenity is added to Policy TWR/4
- The wording of TWR/6 will be reviewed and referred back to the Panel.

APPENDIX C: PRESERVING AND ENHANCING HERITAGE ASSETS

Nia Davies presented a report outlining the importance of safeguarding our heritage assets including all historical aspects of heritage. It is the Local Authority's responsibility to ensure that we preserve and enhance the significance and characteristics of our heritage assets. Appendix C includes a table that lists current legislation and national policies. On this basis, the Plan doesn't include detailed policies that would merely repeat legislation and national policies. This is a list of detailed policies that support the Strategic Policy:

AT1: Conservation Areas, World Heritage Sites and Registered Historic Landscapes, Parks and Gardens

AT2: Enabling Development

AT3: Locally or Regionally Significant Non-Designated Heritage Assets

AT4: Protection of Non-Designation Archaeological Sites

Points that arose:

- Reference was made to the fact that CADW have the responsibility for listing buildings and an enquiry was made about how they define historic gardens, e.g. the Vaynol.
- The detailed policies were supported
- Members were keen to ensure that the policies would be robust and strong enough to reject proposals for pylons within sensitive areas.
- A point was raised that if we are objecting to pylons why do we permit wind turbines?
- It was suggested that not enough recognition is given to 'Tre'r Ceiri' – this is a very important heritage asset.
- It was suggested that the Council doesn't do enough to promote less prominent sites and that local history isn't promoted locally.

Officers' response:

- There are national criteria to define historic gardens.
- Regarding proposals to upgrade the network of pylons, Anglesey and Gwynedd's viewpoints are similar. Both Councils will continue to collaborate in order to ensure that the best option is identified.
- Comments regarding the need to raise awareness locally and amongst visitors about less prominent sites were noted.

Cllr Ann Griffith was thanked for chairing the meeting.

