

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 06-02-23

---

### Present:

**Councillors:** Edgar Owen (Chair)  
Elwyn Edwards (Vice-chair)

Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Elwyn Jones, Elin Hywel, Gareth T. Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Cai Larsen, Gareth A. Roberts, John Pughe Roberts, Huw Rowlands, Gareth Coj Parry and Gruffydd Williams

**Officers:** Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Planning and the Environment), Sion Huws (Solicitor - Propriety and Elections Manager), Keira Sweeney (Planning Manager), Idwal Williams (Development Control Team Leader) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

### 1. APOLOGIES

None to note

### 2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

- a) The following members declared that they were local members in relation to the items noted:
- Councillor Elwyn Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 (C21/1028/18/LL) on the agenda
  - Councillor Gareth A. Roberts (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda (C22/1020/11/LL).

### 3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

### 4. MINUTES

The Chair accepted the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 16 January 2023, as a true record.

### 5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development. Details of the applications were expanded upon, and questions were answered in relation to the plans and policy aspects.

**RESOLVED**

## **5.1 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/1028/18/LL Penisarwaun Nursing Home, Penisarwaun, Caernarfon, Gwynedd, LL55 3DB**

### **Change of use from a care home (C2 Use Class - residential establishments) to a serviced accommodation hostel for holiday use (sui generis use) together with associated warden's living accommodation.**

The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application for a change of use of a former nursing home (C2 Use Class) to be used as a serviced holiday hostel (C1 Use Class - hotels) together with the provision of the warden's integrated living accommodation on a site on the eastern periphery of the settlement of Penisarwaun. It was explained that the existing building comprised 30 bedrooms; stores; kitchens; sitting rooms; boiler room; bathrooms together with administrative/staff rooms.

It was reported that there were a number of local and national policies relating to the principle of providing serviced accommodation, with Policy TWR 2 of the LDP facilitating proposals for serviced holiday accommodation provided the proposal complied with several criteria.

One of criterion is that the proposed development is appropriate in scale considering the site, location and/or settlement in question and that it is in-keeping and fits comfortably into the environment. In response to the noted criteria, that the proposal, amongst other associated uses, meant providing 30 bed/sleeping rooms within the existing building although no further information had been received from the applicants which referred to the number of beds to be provided within these rooms. Although it was not intended to extend the existing structure (apart from the installation of a small-scale flat roof above the existing entrance), it was considered that the proposal, if it were approved, would mean that there would be potential provision for between 60 and 120 occupants/residents within the facility at the same time, and possibly, permanently throughout the year.

It was considered that the development was not located in an area which was mainly residential, nor would it cause significant harm to the residential character of the area, but due to the scale of the proposal (in terms of the number of people who could stay there at the same time) and the constant coming and going from the site that may derive from the use, it would have a significant adverse impact on the amenities of local residents. It was highlighted that this concern reflected the observations received from the objectors to the application.

The second criterion was that the development would not lead to an over-concentration of such accommodation in the area. In response, it was considered that approving the proposal would not lead to an excess of the types of uses within the area, despite the concerns of the objectors regarding this element of the proposal.

In the context of general and residential amenities, it was noted that Policy TWR 2 and the SPG: Tourist Facilities and Holiday Accommodation reiterated the objectives of this policy as any development for holiday accommodation should safeguard residential benefits and the proposed uses should be compatible with adjacent property uses (residential in this case in relation to noise, traffic disturbance, lack of privacy for any adjoining property/nearby property).

It was added that the nature of a hostel type holiday accommodation could create a significant impact at the expense of amenities by creating a noise disturbance either in the form of vehicle/general movements or convening/socialising externally during the day and/or

on evenings of warmer weather. In this particular case, and although the Planning Statement noted that there would be 24-hour supervision of the facility, the LPA anticipated that using the property for a hostel type holiday accommodation of high density (with the potential of having between 60 and 120 residents at a time) would inevitably have a significant impact on nearby residential amenities and the tranquil and relaxed character of the local area. No information or evidence was submitted by the applicant to convince the LPA that the proposal would not have a substantial negative impact on the amenities of nearby residents and occupiers on the grounds of creating a noise nuisance.

In the context of transport matters, it was noted that the Transportation Unit had no concerns regarding the suitability of the county road to cope with traffic that would derive from the holiday accommodation/hostel. However, they were concerned about the lack of parking spaces within the site that may possibly force vehicles to park on the county road carriageway at the expense of road safety.

It was noted that the information submitted with the application by the agent confirmed that there were 21 to 25 formal parking spaces currently within the site with an additional plot of land adjacent to the western gable-end of the building. It was added that, if the principle of the development was acceptable to the LPA, it would be possible for the applicant to submit a comprehensive parking plan for the proposed holiday/hostel accommodation. However, the parking provision proposed as part of the application was not acceptable based on Welsh Government parking requirements.

In assessing the application, full consideration was given to all the relevant policies and the observations received in response to the consultation period and to the responses received from statutory consultees. It was considered that the proposal as submitted was not acceptable on the grounds of a lack of compliance with local and national policies and advice.

a) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:

- That he was speaking to object to the application, in relation to the letters of objection and on behalf of the residents of Penisarwaun who objected to the application
- He was opposed to the application for the following reasons:

Reason 1

- The application was not appropriate in relation to scale and was not in keeping with the previous use of the building.
- The previous use of the building was as a home for elderly people, housing up to a maximum of 30 residents. It had not caused any negative impacts in the village.
- The application could enable the temporary housing of a significantly higher number of residents - although the application did not confirm the maximum number of residents - based on the 30 bedrooms within the building, and other similar hostels in the area, it could be assumed that there could be up to two bunk beds in each bedroom, able to accommodate up to 120 beds.
- Based on these details, the development would have the potential to be the largest hostel of its type in the local area - more than the five nearest hostels combined! If the maximum number of beds was half this number, the impact on the character of the area would be significant, especially as Penisarwaun was a very small village, with no amenities or public services.

Reason 2

- Significant negative impacts on local road safety
- Within the planning application there were a number of references to the expectation that the majority of residents staying in the hostel would use their own private vehicles for transport.
- Based on this expectation and compared to the traffic flow of the former home for the elderly, the hostel's traffic flow would be six times higher, which was likely to be a low estimate.
- It was also important to emphasise that the single road providing access to the site, and the only road into the village, was very narrow and winding, with no pavement and already suffered congestion.
- There would be insufficient parking spaces to meet the demands of the numbers of residents as the application noted that there would only be approximately 21 parking spaces.
- There were a number of other points highlighted in the letters of objection, particularly the significant increase in noise pollution associated with the hostel, and the high density of similar hostels already in the locality.
- Requested that the Committee considered the objections in their consideration of the application.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:

- Not in favour or against the proposal.
- A local family had purchased the property
- The property had been vacant since 2018
- Something needed to be done with the centre
- Questions needed answering before coming to a final decision
- Parking concerns needed to be considered
- The road to the site was narrow and without a pavement – and would increase traffic

ch) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation

d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:

- A suggestion to hold further discussions with the applicant to ensure that the application concurred with the relevant policies
- The application was contrary to the requirements of five relevant policies
- The roads leading to the site were unsuitable – were narrow and not easy to drive along
- The use of the Welsh word 'nepell' in the report, suggested that the site was close to the LDP development boundary. 'Nepell' meant '*far from*' - the English was correct '*a little outside the LDP development boundary*'.
- The development would have a significant impact on the amenities of local residents
- There was insufficient information regarding the proposal's future intentions - what would be the 'end point' of the development?
- Use must be made of the site – it had been left to deteriorate
- It would be possible to create more parking spaces - there was sufficient space on the site

In response to the observation that further discussions should be held with the applicant, the Planning Manager noted that every effort had been made to hold discussions with the agent and the applicant. Consequently, the main impression of the application was a lack of information to fully assess the proposal and the density of the site.

In response to an observation regarding setting a condition to control the number of users, the Assistant Head noted that it would be difficult to control people and that it would be difficult to enforce as a planning condition. It was reiterated that the application's main weakness was insufficient information.

**RESOLVED: TO REFUSE THE APPLICATION BASED ON THE FOLLOWING REASONS:-**

1. **The proposal as submitted is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy PCYFF 1, PCYFF 2 and TWR 2 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan, 2017 together with the advice contained within the document Supplementary Planning Guidance: Tourist Accommodation and Facilities as insufficient information has been submitted confirming the number of beds provided as part of the proposal and, as a consequence of this shortcoming, a detailed consideration of the proposal's impact on local residential amenities cannot be made. Notwithstanding this, and based on the information submitted with the application, it is envisaged that due to the number of bedrooms and the capability of the attraction accommodating a substantial number of residents, the proposal could have an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of local residents on grounds of an increase in noise and general disturbance emanating from the proposed holiday accommodation/hostel.**
2. **The proposal as submitted is considered to be contrary to Policy PCYFF 1 and the guidance contained within Technical Advice Note 6: Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities due to insufficient information being submitted regarding the nature and extent of the manager/warden accommodation within the proposed holiday accommodation/hostel.**
3. **The proposal as submitted is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy TRA 2 and TRA 4 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan, 2017 together with the guidance contained within the document Technical Advice Note 18: Transport as insufficient on-site car parking provision has been proposed and this, in turn, could force vehicles to park along the verge of the adjoining classified road to the detriment of highway safety.**

**5.2 APPLICATION NUMBER: C22/1020/11/LL Former Primary School, Ysgol Glanadda, Llwybr yr Ysgol, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 4SG**

**Construction of a new single-storey 150 place primary school, 20 nursery and 30 Cylch Meithrin places and associated external works, including boundary treatments, new car parking arrangements and improved access provisions for the relocation of Our Lady's School to the former Ysgol Glanadda site.**

- a) The Assistant Head noted that an extraordinary situation had arisen on the morning of the Committee when it appeared that the planning officers had not consulted with all the relevant local members. Although the majority of the proposal site lay within Dewi ward, attention was drawn to a small part of the site within the Central Bangor ward. It was suggested that the decision should be deferred so that consultation could take place with the Local Members for Central Bangor ward - Councillor Huw Wyn Jones and Councillor Medwyn Hughes.
- b) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application

**RESOLVED: To defer in order to consult with all relevant local members**

The meeting commenced at 13:00 and concluded at 13:30

---

**CHAIR**