

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE**

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, County Hall, Ruthin on Wednesday, 15 January 2020 at 9.30 am.

### **PRESENT**

Councillors Ellie Chard, Ann Davies, Alan James (Vice-Chair), Brian Jones, Tina Jones, Gwyneth Kensler, Merfyn Parry, Pete Prendergast, Andrew Thomas, Tony Thomas, Julian Thompson-Hill, Joe Welch (Chair), Emrys Wynne and Mark Young

### **ALSO PRESENT**

Councillor Meirick Lloyd Davies, Councillor Hugh Evans and Councillor Eryl Williams, Head of Planning, Public Protection and Countryside Services (EJ) Team Leader – Places Team (SC); Development Control Manager (PM); Principal Planning Officer (IW); Planning Officer (PDG); Minerals officer (HP) and Committee Administrator (RTJ)

#### **1 APOLOGIES**

Councillors Christine Marston, Bob Murray, Melvyn Mile, Peter Evans and Huw Jones.

#### **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Emrys Wynne declared a personal interest in agenda item 7 – as he knew the applicants personally.

#### **3 URGENT MATTERS AS AGREED BY THE CHAIR**

None.

#### **4 MINUTES**

The minutes of the Planning Committee held on 11 December 2019 were submitted.

***RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on 11 December 2019 be approved as a correct record.*

#### **5 APPLICATION NO. 25/2018/1216 - BWLCH DU, NANTGLYN**

An application was submitted for alterations and a rear extension to the existing building, demolition of curtilage structure, erection of an ancillary building, retention of a log cabin (for a temporary period), boundary fencing and gates, and provision of on-site parking and turning area at Bwlch Du, Nantglyn, Denbigh.

The Vice Chair, Councillor Alan James took the Chair for this item because the Chair, Councillor Joe Welch was the Local Member.

## **Public Speaker –**

John Litton QC (**Against**) – represented Brenig Windfarm who objected the proposed developments. He stated that the committee had three issues to consider.

The first issue was whether the existing building had lawful residential use. On this issue there were five points. Firstly the appropriate way to resolve the issue would be for the applicant to apply for a lawful development certificate. Secondly the site was enforced against in 2018 which resulted in a failed appeal by the applicant, the good sense of applying for a certificate was referred to by the inspector who said 'statute has provided a means for legally determining or establishing the planning status of land, a lawful development certificate'. No certificate exists, or to his knowledge no application has been made. Following the site visit on Friday it was noted that there had been further breaches to planning and listed building control. Thirdly if the applicant had applied for a certificate they would have had to support the application by evidence including sworn statements. The inference which can be drawn from the failure to apply is that they realise an application would fail. Fourthly the fact that any residential use of the building has been abandoned was the long held position of the Council who have sought and received independent legal advice on the issue on at least two occasions. Fifthly there is nothing before members including the material submitted on behalf of the applicant which would allow them to reasonably reach a different conclusion to officers.

The second issue was if the building does not have existing residential use, was the change of use and other proposed development in accordance the Local Development Plan? The correct position set out by officers in reports since July 2019 was that granting permission for change of use and proposed developments would be contrary to the local plan both in principle and because of the adverse planning impacts on the visual and landscape character of the area, with the ecology and the building as a listed building. It would also have an impact on the amenities of any future occupiers of the building because of the potential noise from the nearby turbines. Very importantly granting permission for any residential use, would likely curtail the operation of one or more of the existing turbines, which would be wholly inconsistent with the critical need to produce renewable energy to help address the climate emergency which has been given so much recent media attention, therefore granting permission would be contrary to the local plan, Planning Policy Wales and TAN8 for the clear reasons given by officers.

The third issue was if the existing building has a lawful residential use, was the proposed development in accordance with the development plan? Even if it was concluded that any residential use of the building has not been abandoned, permission should still be refused for the reasons given by officers.

Mark Davies (**For**) - thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak. It was clarified that he was present whilst the item was discussed in September, and in his opinion Councillors did speak clearly and in a manner consistent with their decision which was made. However before getting to those reasons, he referred to points which were made in the course of discussions which should be borne in mind.

Firstly and foremost the point was made that when the committee considered the risks to the Council at committee they should consider the risks to the applicants with the potential risk of loss of the home which they purchased.

Secondly it was simple case of a dilapidated building in Denbighshire that someone wants to renovate and live in. It has mushroomed out of all proportion, however that was the bottom line that it was a rundown building that two people in the County want to do up and live in.

Thirdly one committee member on the last occasion referenced the Council's commitment to bring 500 homes back into use. It was the empty home delivery plan, launched in April last year, and the Committee were invited to bear that in mind when considering the application.

Finally, with regard to the point which was made at the previous meeting, that simply because a mistake had been made when assessing Bwlch Du as a dwelling house during the windfarm consenting progress, this should not prejudice the applicants in their application this time, and the committee were invited to bear all of the points in mind when considering their decision.

Turning back to the four grounds of refusal set out in the officers' report: First, in relation to the matter of abandonment, Councillor Welch spoke on the issue previously and the details are set out in minutes which have been previously approved. In relation to the physical condition of Bwlch Du, for a building 1,400 feet above sea level it is good, it has a roof, chimney and four solid walls. Another member seconded that assessment when looking at the building on the monitors. On the second test it was clear it had only been used for residential purposes. On the third test, in respect of the length of time it had been unoccupied, there was evidence that it had been occupied into the 1960's with reliable witness evidence that it had been used as a weekend cottage more recently. Finally in respect of the intentions of the owners, here an important point raised previously was the payment of council tax. If the property was not a house, it was questioned why would the owner continue to pay that amount. In conclusion, Mr Davies invited the Committee to consider the submissions and any others which may be relevant and make a definitive finding that Bwlch Du was not and never has been abandoned.

Secondly in relation to the setting of the listed building, it was suggested that impacts of the proposals should be balanced against the presence of a wind farm situated about 600m away. It was suggested the turbines do form part of the setting and that was a perfectly legitimate consideration, and members were invited to give the setting considerable importance and weight as required, and conclude that there was no adverse impact.

In regards to ecology, attention was drawn to Policy VOE5 and technical advice note 5, taken together unless it was evident the proposals would cause serious harm, this was not a reason for refusal.

**General Debate:**

Planning officers introduced the item and offered members additional information about the report and why it had been returned to Planning Committee following previously being discussed in September 2019. This was in line with the adopted scheme of delegation as there was a potential risk to the Council as outlined in the report. The officers' recommendation was to refuse the application, as set out in the report. Members were asked to give consideration to the report and if they decided to go against officer recommendations, it was requested that the reasons should be clear.

Councillor Joe Welch (**Local Member**) commented that as some members were not in attendance for the previous Planning Committee in September he would reiterate points which were covered. The reference to Councillor Richard Welsh was incorrect. Natural Power's representations that local residents had not raised Bwlch Du as being a residential dwelling during the wind farm application process, was irrelevant. Whether the building had been abandoned or not depended on the 4 tests of abandonment, not on local views about it. It was also highlighted that the decision which was reached at the last meeting was clear and concise.

Members queried with officers why the windfarm application had not been returned to be discussed, similar to the application for Bwlch Du.

Officers responded to the queries and points raised. It was suggested that the appropriate mechanism for testing abandonment was through an application for a certificate of lawfulness of use, which had never been submitted. When the Windfarm applications were under consideration, receptors were identified for assessment of impacts. Bwlch Du was referred to as derelict and was not included. The Council dealt with the information as presented and had no evidence submitted to challenge this. The windfarm applications had been determined and could not now be revisited.

Members who attended the site visit to Bwlch Du were impressed with the integrity of the building. It was also mentioned that the building was listed on the 15<sup>th</sup> December 1998 and was described as a domestic property, and it had not been taken from the list. It was also highlighted that the issue of Bwlch Du being a permanent dwelling was irrelevant as a semi-permanent dwelling was still a dwelling. The question of Council tax payments was queried and why was this still being collected if the property was deemed as abandoned.

Officers advised that Council tax had been collected on Bwlch Du until 2016 when the current owners challenged payments.

Councillor Mark Young felt that the comments that the previous decision the committee came to were not clear, were unfair and incorrect. The issues were very difficult, and it was necessary to conduct a balanced debate for all involved with the matter. He stated that a building would need to be defined as a dwelling for council tax to be collected, and the valuation office would only delete a property off the list if they believed it was truly beyond repair.

Councillor Joe Welch (**Local Member**) commented on the four tests of abandonment as follows –

- Physical condition of the building: the building at 1,400 feet above sea-level was very high for buildings in Wales. Despite this it had a roof, a chimney and four walls in good condition, and overall it was in pretty good condition.
- Length of time for which the building had not been utilised for residential purposes: there was a statement by a local resident Mr Emyr Pierce who said the building had been used as a weekend cottage.
- The third point of abandonment was not argued.
- The owners' intention was clear, that they intended to make a home in Bwlch Du.

Councillor Welch suggested there were two options open to Members - the committee could either agree with officers that the building was abandoned or not; if the committee disagreed, then there would have to be clear reasons why the committee concluded thus. In relation to the reasons:

- The first reason given by officers was on abandonment, and it was clear the four tests were not met as above, with council tax having been collected.
- The second reason was in respect of the log cabin and the siting and scale of the proposed ancillary building having an adverse visual impact in an area of remote open countryside. It was noted that the log cabin would be temporary, and would be removed once Bwlch Du was completed. In appreciating the issue, it was felt the impact was not severe enough to refuse planning permission. The ancillary building could be screened to alleviate concerns. The visual amenities of the building was harmed by the windfarm which was built near to Bwlch Du.
- The third reason was that there was insufficient information submitted to demonstrate that the proposed development would not adversely impact on protected species. Natural Resources Wales (NRW) had been consulted and objected to the application originally. However on receipt of additional information they had changed their opinion, their response being "as this was a lower risk case for bats, we consider that the development was not likely to be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in its natural range. Furthermore we advise that the proposed development is not likely to harm or disturb the bats or their breeding sites and resting places at this site". It was noted that the County Ecologist disagreed with NRW's assessment, but Councillor Welch was happy to support NRW's stance, especially considering that this had changed after receiving additional information.
- In relation to the fourth reason, if the committee agreed that the building was not abandoned then the property would have been there prior to the wind turbines, and the reason would not be appropriate.

**PROPOSAL** – Councillor Joe Welch proposed the application be granted, contrary to officer recommendation for the reasons he had stated in the debate. Seconded by Councillor Gwyneth Kensler.

Councillor Andrew Thomas queried whether the financial risk to the Council should be considered as a material planning matter. Members also queried if Bwlch Du

was developed as a dwelling whether some of the nearby wind turbines would need to stop being used.

Officers advised that financial risk was not a material planning matter, but Officers had a duty to outline all risks to the Council which could be involved with the application. It was also clarified that the matter was brought back to Committee to ensure that there were no flaws in the decision made by Planning Committee. In regards to the wind turbines, it was suggested there would be issues in regards to wellbeing and noise levels at Bwlch Du. Councillor Mark Young stated that on occasions blades of turbines have been changed to lower the noise created.

**Proposal** Councillor Gwyneth Kensler proposed a recorded vote be carried out. The proposal was not seconded and a recorded vote was not taken.

Members requested that if the application was granted, an item be returned to committee for members to ratify the conditions to be attached to a permission.

**VOTE:**

GRANT – 12

REFUSE – 2

ABSTAIN – 0

**RESOLVED** that permission be **GRANTED**, contrary to officer recommendation on the following grounds that the property has an existing lawful residential use, any impact of the proposed development, on the visual amenity on the listed building and wider open landscape can be mitigated and it is not likely to have a detrimental effect on a protected species.

**6 APPLICATION NO. 20/2019/0884 - LAND ADJACENT TO BWLCH Y LLYN, PENTRE COCH, RUTHIN**

An application was submitted for the development of 0.125ha of land by the erection of a detached local needs affordable dwelling and associated works (outline application - all matters reserved) at Land opposite Land adjacent to Bwlch y Llyn, Pentre Coch, Ruthin

**Public Speaker –**

Denise Baker (**For**) - informed the committee that the family had been farming in the location for five generations, and were a Welsh speaking family which have always supported the local community, and continue to do so. The application was for a self-build affordable need house, which was for a young member of the family who wished to remain in the area and close to the family. The proposal was for a modest home in harmony with the area's character, and use of local construction material. Given the exceptional nature of such a development it was acknowledged a design sensitive to the area would be required. The proposed site of the development was on land owned by the family and the concerns of consultees over the development occurring in open countryside was understood. However the previous house on the site could be taken into consideration. The previous dwelling was called Waen Grogen, the proposed site was a brown field site, which had no

agricultural benefit. The house could not be seen from any other houses, and additional screening could be carried to lessen the visibility further. The applicants' intention was to allow future generations of the family to live in the property for the future. However legal agreements could be put in place to ensure someone with close ties to the area would live in the dwelling, as long as affordable needs existed in the area.

### **General Debate:**

Councillor Hugh Evans (Local Member) referred to six other applications which were very similar to this, and they had been granted. The application would allow a local Denbighshire resident to stay within the County, which was a part of the corporate plan, the Welsh language would also be preserved in the area. The average cost of houses in the area was in excess of £300,000 and having affordable housing would allow a young member of society to stay in the area. It was also highlighted that there was a shortage of affordable housing in the rural areas. The proposal would also bring an abandoned house back into use. The application did not pass some of the planning policies but did meet the corporate priorities. If the application was accepted it would not set a precedent across the county.

Officers responded to the local member's questions in regards to policy BSC8 and BSC9 and the tests for these policies. In regards to BSC8 the applicant had not provided evidence to demonstrate that allocated housing sites were not likely to come forward within 5 years the site clearly did not adjoin the development boundary of the village, which was 1.2km to the west of the proposal. In regards to policy BSC9 the property would be developed well away from the farm and would be in the open countryside. It was also noted that the applicant was not in affordable housing need, based on standard tests including income and savings, as assessed by Grwp Cynefin.

**Proposal** Councillor Tony Thomas, proposed the development be granted contrary to officer recommendation as the development met the Council's corporate plan, seconded by Councillor Emrys Wynne.

Members highlighted that the property would be developed on land which had no agricultural benefit and it was queried whether there was a previous property at the site and whether that it would have an impact on the application in planning terms. It was also queried why the financial background of the applicant was required for the application, as other applicants in Denbighshire seeking affordable housing were not asked about their financial situation. It was also suggested that conditions be included on the application that the old stone of the derelict building be used on the new house.

Responding, officers clarified that there were no specific planning policy provisions for rebuilding derelict buildings. In regards to the affordable housing query, it was necessary to test qualification for local needs affordable housing as the application was submitted on this basis. Conditions could be attached to any permission to control use of external materials.

Councillor Hugh Evans (Local Member) thanked the committee for the debate on the matter, and accepted the application might not meet all planning policies. However the application did meet the Council's corporate policies of allowing a young resident to stay within the community. It was also outlined that he did not believe granting this application would set a dangerous precedent with similar applications, and reassured members that the applicants would conform to any conditions which could be agreed upon.

**VOTE:**

GRANT – 8

REFUSE – 5

ABSTAIN – 1

**RESOLVED** that permission be **GRANTED**, contrary to officer recommendation, on the grounds that the development would conform to the Corporate Plan for the Young People.

**7 APPLICATION NO. 01/2019/0757 - GRAIG QUARRY, GRAIG ROAD, DENBIGH**

An application was submitted for Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 01/2009/1424/PS to allow continuation of extraction of permitted reserves at Graig Quarry, Graig Road, Denbigh.

**Public Speakers –**

Dr Susan Hewitt (**Against**) – informed the committee that she resided in Pen y Craig and represented locals who were affected by the activities in the quarry. The nearby homes were already damaged due to the extraction at the quarry. It was raised that the blasting limits had not been breached, however local residents had received information that the measurements were being taken on grassed areas. It was also outlined that no seismic recordings were taken from the surrounding houses. It was also stated that a local builder had informed the residents of the surrounding area that the houses build quality was poor, which made them more susceptible to damage from the quarry.

The committee were invited to the houses to experience the shaking whilst blasting takes place. Sound noise pollution could be higher than the average noise which could cause damage to ears and hearing of local residents. Dust particles which would be circulated due to the quarry operation was highlighted as a concern especially Particulate Matter (PM), which lodges in bodies and can cause illnesses. The World Health Organisation stated that there was no safe exposure level. The PM has detrimental effect on bodies and health and wellbeing, as the particles did not disperse over distance and therefore the whole of Denbigh would be affected. The particulate levels were recorded in Denbigh on the high street, however no data was recorded nearby to the quarry, therefore the data within the reports did not highlight the risks to those who resided next to the quarry. There should be full health impact assessment taken with the quarry, and she wanted the committee to realise the risk to health the quarry would have on local residents and urged them to reject the application.



Malcolm Ellis (**For**) thanked the committee for debating the application. The quarry would supply for local needs. The development would have conditions which would alleviate any negative effects on local residents. The quarry employed 16 local residents at the quarry. The quarry spent £1.2 million into the local community and paid the workers an average of 30% above of the minimum wage. There would be no increase in traffic or the amount which would be extracted at the quarry, the application was for an 8 year extension to the time permitted for extraction. If the application was refused the materials would need to be sought elsewhere which would have a larger carbon footprint than the current usage of the quarry. In regards to blasting and concerns raised, the procedures were being looked at and improved. Local residents were also invited to a presentation which gave information on the blasting and how it was carried out. The quarry would be willing to listen to concerns from local residents and continue to increase the standards at the quarry.

### **General Debate:**

Councillor Gwyneth Kensler (**Local Member**) informed the committee that the matter was a complicated one. It was clear that the blasting had an impact on the surrounding buildings as cracks had appeared. There was consultation meeting organised by Breedon Southern Limited in Denbigh Rugby club on the 4<sup>th</sup> December 2019 which discussed the physical extension of the quarry which would be a separate planning matter. Since she had attended the consultation, the effect of the quarry on local residents become apparent as the work started again in 2016.

Councillor Kensler highlighted the matter of the dust and especially the concerns with dust particles PM10 and PM2.5, as the particles could penetrate into the body and cause detrimental effect to people's health. This would be very prominent in asthma suffers in Denbigh. The Local Development Plan (LPD) draft annual monitoring report highlighted there was a national policy to improve the air quality. The regional technical documents had completed a second technical review, and within the report the biggest change since the first review was the Future of Wellbeing Generations Act Local authorities needed to consider health concerns of future generations. The sources of supply were highlighted - the largest amount of limestone was sent to the North West of England. A planning appeal involving Burley Hill quarry was mentioned as it was rejected as it was considered the development would have a detrimental effect on nature and the benefits did not outweigh the negatives. In regards to the complaints in the report, members of the public did not know who to report their concerns to, as they believed the application would be put through regardless of their concerns. The employment numbers which were indicated were not all from the Denbigh area.

**Proposal** Councillor Gwyneth proposed the application be rejected.

Planning officers responded to points which were raised by the local member Gwyneth Kensler. The application was for the extension of time to extract aggregate from the quarry but not to extend the quarry itself. This would allow 1 million tonnes to be extracted in an area which had already been permitted. The extension in time would also allow the area to be restored.

The main issues which had been raised were blasting, dust and the health impacts, and the need for the mineral, and the noise which was produced. In regards to the blasting, the technical guidance on blasting was noted in the report on page 34 point 4.2.5. The monitoring was carried out by multiple organisations and was under the guidance levels. Noise information on blasting was recorded and had not been close to the maximum levels permitted and was unlikely to result in damage to surrounding residents. In regards to the frequency of blasting it would occur twelve times a year, the blasting protocols were also included as conditions within the report. Dust concerns had been raised, especially with the PM and the advice given by environmental officers was that the dust mitigation at the site was adequate, and cleaning of vehicles and dust mitigation was included in the report. Planning conditions could be included to mitigate any concerns local residents had with dust.

There had been no objections raised by Natural Resources Wales in regards to biodiversity. The quarry was mothballed and was not dormant, it was also stated if the application was refused, the 1 million tonnes of limestone would need to be sourced elsewhere in North Wales.

Officers informed members that the nearest property was beyond the buffer zone of the quarry. The quarry did supply for local needs, as an example, it was used for the windfarm which was developed in Cloceanog.

Members sought clarification of the controls proposed over annual production and whether there were contingencies in place for occasions when there was a large demand and the volume sought was above the permitted levels of extraction. The distance from blasting to houses was queried and whether there was additional information on these distances. It was also queried whether the decision on the application would have a bearing on any future applications. There were also questions whether dust could be created from sources other than the quarry, over the timing of the blasting events, and finally whether there could be permanent measuring equipment to ensure recording data was accurate.

Officer responded to the queries. In regards to the production, it was clarified that the existing restriction was 500,000 tonnes per annum, however the current output was 200,000 tonnes, and the quarry owners were happy to reduce this to 400,000 tonnes, which would still allow the quarry to be flexible in meeting demand. The amount of blasts was set at 12 times a year, however if more was required consent would be required. There had been 7 blasts in the previous year. The blasting takes place on Tuesdays, so there was public awareness. This application would not have an impact on any future applications as the issues were different and proposals have to be assessed on their merits. There was no exact information on the distance from the blasts and housing, but there was a buffer of 200m from the boundary of the site to dwellings which was deemed as acceptable. Dust particles would occur from other sources. The quarry company were going to fit fixed monitoring devices to record the vibrations.

Councillor Joe Welch requested additional information on the grounds of refusal proposed by Councillor Gwyneth Kensler. Councillor Kensler indicated the main reason for refusal was the Wellbeing of Future Generations Act. It was also queried within what time period the restoration plan for the quarry would be implemented.

Councillor Brian Jones queried whether the application could be deferred to get additional health and safety information.

Officers responded that the restoration programme would need to be submitted in 6 months, and restoration works would be carried out on completion of extraction. If the application was granted the officers would ensure that the plan would be submitted in 6 months.

**Proposal** Councillor Mark Young proposed the application be granted in accordance with officer recommendation, with the condition that no blasting take place on weekends, seconded by Councillor Julian Thompson-Hill.

**VOTE:**

GRANT – 12

REFUSE – 2

ABSTAIN – 0

**RESOLVED** that permission be **GRANTED** in accordance with officer recommendations as detailed within the report and supplementary papers

**8 APPLICATION NO. 24/2018/0206 - PLAS LLANYNYS, LLANYNYS, DENBIGH**

An application was submitted for the erection of a free range egg production unit including silos and associated works including access at Plas Llanynys, Llanynys, Denbigh.

**Public Speaker –**

Tom Jones (**For**) – Thanked the committee for the opportunity to speak. He informed the committee that his was the third generation to farm at Plas Llanynys. Historically the farm was a dairy enterprise however with the death of his father in 2003 the farm had no one available to run it, and the cattle and equipment were sold. After almost two decades re-establishing a dairy farm, this was economically unviable. The new building proposed would maximise bird welfare, with specialised equipment, the design would allow the birds to roam freely in the surrounding area. A new building was required as the existing buildings were designed to hold cattle. The dimensions of the proposed new build were compliant with the requirements of current regulations and guidance and the RSPCA, which regulate the amount of space each bird requires. The proposed building had a 12% smaller footprint than a 32,000 bird unit, which were more common. Given the size of the farm, the options to grow a sustainable farming business were very limited, however by researching the free range egg industry the applicant believed that this application was the best and most viable option to bring the business out of stagnation. The application would boost the local economy, providing full time employment for the applicant and at least one part time job. The application would secure the farm's future, which could be passed down to future generations. The regulatory bodies did not object to the proposal and the local community council were in favour of the application. The proposed building was at the furthest point from other homes, which would mitigate any impact on local residents.

### **General Debate:**

Councillor Merfyn Parry (**Local Member**) – informed the committee that the application would allow a local farm to come back into use, and commended the applicant and officers on the work which had been carried out to mitigate local concerns with the application.

**Proposal** – Councillor Emrys Wynne proposed the application be granted in accordance with officer recommendations. Seconded by Alan James.

### **VOTE:**

GRANT – 10

REFUSE – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

**RESOLVED** that permission be **GRANTED** in accordance with officer recommendations as detailed within the report and supplementary papers

## **9 APPLICATION NO. 12/2019/0912 - LAND OPPOSITE TY NEWYDD, CLAWDDNEWYDD, RUTHIN**

An application was submitted for the Development of 0.14 ha of land by the erection of 3 no. detached dwellings (outline application including access) at Land opposite Ty Newydd Clawddnewydd Ruthin.

### **General Debate**

Councillor Eryl Williams (**Local Member**) advised there have been objections against the application. There were highway concerns and residents did not want ribbon development in the area. It was suggested that a kerbstone be included in the proposal to allow bins to be put out without impeding onto the highway. Attention was drawn to the detailing of the proposed development and the entrances to the road.

Members queried whether the development was in a flood risk area. It was requested that a condition be included that the kerbing and street lighting be implemented prior to any development.

Officers responded with regards to the plan, the entrances posed no concern to the highway officers. The matter of kerbing was covered by condition 8 which was included in the report. Surface water would be contained within the application site and would not have an effect on the highway.

**Proposal** Councillor Merfyn Parry proposed the application be granted in accordance with officer recommendations, seconded by Councillor Emrys Wynne.

### **VOTE:**

GRANT – 10

REFUSE – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

***RESOLVED** that permission be **GRANTED** in accordance with officer recommendations as detailed within the report and supplementary papers.*

**10 INFORMATION REPORT - WELSH GOVERNMENT CONSULTATION ON CHANGES TO PLANNING AND RELATED APPLICATION FEES**

***RESOLVED** that the Planning Committee note the content of the report.*