

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 11 September 2023

---

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

**Councillors:** Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Elwyn Jones, Gareth T Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Cai Larsen, Gareth Coj Parry, Gareth Roberts, John Pughe Roberts, Huw Rowlands and Gruffydd Williams

**Officers:** Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Planning and the Environment), Sion Huws (Legal Services), Iwan ap Trefor (Traffic and Projects Service Manager), Gwawr Hughes (Development Control Team Leader), Glyn Llewelyn Gruffydd (Senior Planning Officer) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

**Others invited:**

Swyn Hughes and Elen Morris (Professional Trainees in Environment Planning) - observing

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Elin Hywel

### 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 Gruffydd Williams (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 6.1 (C21/1220/42/LL) on the agenda
  - Councillor Gareth A Roberts (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 6.2 (C22/1169/15/LL) on the agenda
  - Councillor Gareth Morris Tudor Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 6.4 (C23/0201/08/LL) on the agenda

### 3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

### 4. MINUTES

The Chair accepted the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 17 July 2023, subject to ensuring that bullet point 2 in item 5.3ch (application number C22/1169/15/LL Llanberis Library, Ffordd Capel Coch, Llanberis <<https://gwynedd-planning.tascomi.com/locations/index.html?fa=edit&id=42543>>) in the English version corresponds to the Welsh version:

*Awgrym i ystyried codi dau dŷ yn hytrach na thri, fyddai'n rhyddhau lle parcio  
It was suggested that two ~~three~~ dwellings be erected instead of three ~~two~~, which would release parking spaces*

## 5. APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER UNDER THE ROAD TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT ACT 1984

Community: Llanberis and Nant Peris      Ward: Llanberis

Proposal: Gwynedd Council Order (various County roads, Arfon Area) (30mph speed restriction) 2023

- a) It was reported that a Restricted Roads (20mph Speed Limit) (Wales) Order 2022 had been made by Welsh Ministers on 13 July 2022 following Senedd Cymru's decision. Before 17 September 2023, local authorities should consider which restricted roads must stay at 30mph. To this end, the Council had introduced a 30mph order for Arfon, Dwyfor and Meirionnydd areas with the Arfon order including an intention to keep the speed restriction at 30mph on 37 sections of the road in the area.

The proposed 20mph Scheme was consulted upon with stakeholders in December 2022 as part of the pre-consultation process where observations were received and changes were introduced to the schemes. Further consultations on the proposed schemes were held with stakeholders and members of the public in April 2023. In July 2023, as part of the statutory consultation process, an e-mail was received objecting to the order for two sections of the A4086 Class 1 Road from Llanberis Community Council (although reasons for the objections had not been submitted).

In response to the objections, it was noted that Officers were of the opinion that these sections of the road should stay at 30mph as the road was a first class road, that the number of houses on the side of the road was smaller than 20 buildings/km and that there were only dwellings without a private access road from the highway on one side of the road and it would affect the emergency services. It was reiterated that the roads in question were currently 30mph and, therefore, the order did not propose any change to the road's current situation. Although officers fully understood the wishes of Llanberis Community Council, those wishes did not correspond with the guidance set out by the Welsh Government. Despite this, the Traffic Unit would continue to monitor traffic on these sections of the road with the intention of reviewing the decision in 6 months.

It was reiterated that the requirements of the Equality Act 2010 and the Well-being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 had been considered when assessing the proposal.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the exceptions.
- c) During the ensuing discussion, the following observation by a Member was noted:
- These sections of the road were very short, therefore, keep at 20mph for safety.

In response to an observation about implementing a small 30mph section on Ffordd Pentre' Castell before reducing further to 20mph, it was noted that the Traffic Unit had deemed reducing from 60mph to 20mph as too much of a step and, therefore, a short 30mph buffer had been implemented to reduce speed gradually.

**RESOLVED:**

**To approve keeping the speed restriction at 30mph on a section of the road near Pendre Castell on the A4086 and keeping the speed restriction at 30mph on the A4086 between Nant Peris park and ride and Pont Gwastadnant.**

## **6. 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**

#### **6.1 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/1220/42/LL Morlais Lôn Penrallt, Nefyn, Pwllheli**

Demolition of existing dwelling and construct a new dwelling in its place, and work to stabilise the cliffs

Some Members had visited the site on 05-09-23

- a) The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that the application had already been discussed at a meeting of the Planning Committee held on 17 July 2023. At that time it had been resolved to defer the decision in order to conduct a site visit so that Members had an opportunity to see the site in the context of its location.

It was noted that it was a full application for the demolition of an existing dwelling and construction of a replacement dwelling, together with work to stabilise coastal cliffs. Externally, the new house would include a pitched roof finished in dark zinc and the finishes of the exterior walls would be a combination of timber boards on the upper floor and natural stone on the lower floors. It was noted that the site and existing building were located at the foot of the cliffs of Nefyn Beach, and the cliffs had been designated as the Clogwyni Pen Llŷn Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and was also the Porthdinllaen to Porth Pistyll Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It was added that the site was outside the current development boundary of Nefyn with access gained to the site along the beach as well as a public footpath that led down from the top of the cliff past the site and onwards to the beach below.

It was explained that the existing site contained a house that dated back to the late 1960s/early 1970s and of a style that included flat roofs and its appearance conveyed those of that era. The site and the wider area was within the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest designation, and outside a nearby flood zone (which only applied to the beach). It was noted that elements of the proposal had been amended since the original submission as a result of comments received, which included the external finishes of the dwelling following a comment by the AONB Unit (although the site was not within the AONB, these were considered as general comments).

It was added that originally, a part of the proposal involved diverting the existing public footpath that ran past the site and repositioning it to be further from the building. Following discussions and after receiving comments on the proposal from the Council's Rights of Way Unit, Nefyn Town Council and members of the public, it had been decided that the proposal was too contentious and therefore the path would stay as it was. The application had been submitted to the committee by the Local Member for

reasons of it being an over-development of the site, that it would destabilise the cliffs and have an adverse impact on the area.

In the context of relevant policies, reference was made to the requirements of policy PS 5 which stated that priority should be given to the effective use of land and infrastructure, prioritising the re-use of previously used land and buildings, wherever possible. In this case, a dwelling already existed and the site was already developed, therefore the proposal satisfied the general requirements of policy PS 5 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (JLDP). It was added that Policy TAI 13 of the LDP related specifically to replacement dwellings and set a series of criteria that must be conformed to (where appropriate) in order to approve such schemes.

It was noted that the application had obviously involved some considerable scrutiny due to a number of specialist considerations that would not normally be found to the same degree at least, with the majority of Planning applications to demolish and re-build residential housing. It was reported that qualified companies and/or individuals had assessed the information to hand and had stated their opinion, and that the findings and recommendations of the specialist reports would be included as formal conditions so that the development would have to be carried out in strict conformity to the recommended measures. By ensuring this, the development would be carried out in full compliance with the general consent agreed. Should the situation change in terms of amending the proposal in response to a situation that arises, then we would have to respond at that time to any new situation.

In response to some of the objections that had been received expressing concern that granting permission would set a dangerous precedent, it was noted that there was a lawful right to have a dwelling on the site, and that the applicant would be entitled to adapt it without planning permission. It was noted that the size and bulk of the house matched the existing dwelling, but a pitched roof was proposed instead of a flat roof.

For the purpose of the application, it was noted that the specialist information had been assessed and found to be acceptable. The proposal was considered acceptable and in compliance with the requirements of the relevant policies.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- Thanked those Members who had visited the site
  - That the location was within the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest and abutted significant sites such as Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) and Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)
  - That the proposed building was not an improvement to the existing building. It was a matter of opinion as to whether the proposal's design was an improvement
  - A vast number of local residents had objected
  - The original application had included moving the footpath - he welcomed that the route of the path would remain unchanged - needed a condition to secure the use of the path for fishermen and the public
  - If approved, there was a need to ensure that the footpath to the beach was protected during the construction period and remained open for fishermen and pedestrians

- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application
- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- Gave thanks for the opportunity to visit the site
  - The proposal was an improvement to what already existed
  - The existing site did not appear as a dwelling
  - The existing building was formless, shabby and distasteful compared to the area's traditional cottages
  - Black and grey colours were not in-keeping with the area – they were dark colours
  - In time, there would be complaints as to why the proposal was approved, as was seen with the existing building!
  - The building would be part of an iconic view that was seen when driving from Pistyll towards Nefyn
  - The proposal was not an improvement

In response to a question regarding 'de-risking' and what this meant in the context of the cliffs' stability, it was noted that the applicant was responsible for ensuring that the land was suitable for the development proposed, and when adopting a de-risking method on the level of the plan, that the local planning authority would impose conditions to address risks. It was added that concerns about the cliffs' instability had been discussed and that the specialist evidence submitted by the applicant had been verified by engineering specialists noting that the specialist report had been completed by competent and experienced individuals who were obviously satisfied with the findings of the report as it was.

Considering the assessments undertaken, the specialist opinion provided and the lack of information or technical and specialist information to contradict by proving beyond doubt that the plans and measures made were unsuitable, it must be accepted that the construction plan and mitigation measures proposed were appropriate to protect the proposal. It was the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the building was operated in accordance with the plans.

In response to the observations relating to finishes and materials, the Senior Planning Officer noted that it would be possible to impose conditions to manage this. He added that the illustrations only included suggestions, but different resources could be agreed upon such as stone, timber, slates. He noted that he was confident that the finish could be agreed upon so that there would be no impact and that the building assimilated better to the background.

In response to a comment regarding imposing a condition to ensure the safety of public footpath users during the construction period, it was noted that public protection was a fundamental condition for the proposal, along with an application for a building control plan.

**RESOLVED: To approve with conditions**

- 1. Time**
- 2. In accordance with plans**
- 3. Materials**
- 4. Building Control Plan**

- 5. Biodiveristy Matters**
- 6. Matters relating to the cliff**
- 7. Protect the public footpath**
- 8. Withdrawal of PD rights**

**6.2 Application Number C23/0432/11/LL Helipad, Ysbyty Gwynedd, Penrhosgarnedd, Bangor. LL57 2PW**

Removal of the existing helicopter landing pad and construction of two new landing stages to support the existing hospital. The work will include re-grading the soft landscape to include a new access road, landing pads including all surface water drainage, markings and illuminated landing barriers, new safety fences and enclosures to maintain the helicopters.

a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application for the creation of a new landing facility for helicopters near Ysbyty Gwynedd in Bangor. The work would include:

- removing the existing helicopter landing pad
- creating two new landing areas by:
  - re-grading the landscape and creating two embankments with a circular shaped flat plot behind them
  - installation of hard standings for landing pads
  - surface water drainage work
  - installation of new illuminated landing barriers
  - erection of security fencing
  - creation of enclosures in order to maintain the helicopters
  - associated engineering work.

It was explained that the landing pad was located approximately 150m to the east of the hospital, on a plot of sloped land on an elevated site above the city, which, according to the Civil Aviation Authority, offers very good flight paths into and out of the hospital grounds. The hospital stands on the southern peripheries of Bangor Subregional Centre in the area of Penrhosgarnedd. The site is also partly located within the buffer zone of Crug Goetre Uchaf Registered Monument.

In the context of the principle of the development, it was considered that this was a scheme to enhance an essential service offered to the communities of Gwynedd and that it met the relevant criteria as listed under Criterion 1, Policy ISA 2 of the LDP and, therefore, the principle of the application was acceptable.

In the context of general amenities, it was noted that this development would be in a concealed location from the majority of nearby viewpoints. Public footpath number 39 in the Community of Bangor ran past the northern boundary of the site, however, there was a mature hedge between this path and the site. The majority of the views from the site were from a distance and in the context of the existing developed site and the hospital nearby. When considering the local landscape and existing trees and hedges surrounding the site, it was not believed that there would be a significant change to the view of the site as observed from the outside.

It was noted that there was potential for noise and disturbance to emanate from this type of facility but this was unlikely to be significantly worse than what already happened. There would not be a significant increase in the use made of the site, instead, it would be possible to deal more efficiently with the transport that needed to use the landing pads, particularly in an emergency when more than one helicopter would need to land in a short space of time.

It was highlighted that the site was approximately 200m from the nearest residential houses and it was not believed that there would be a significant additional harm caused to the amenities of local residents deriving from the development and, therefore, the proposal was acceptable in terms of the requirements of policies PCYFF 2 and PCYFF 3 of the LDP.

In the context of biodiversity matters, it was noted that an ecological assessment of the site had been submitted, which concluded that there was no special biodiversity interest to the site itself, although the boundaries were of significance to wildlife and were visually important. The report recommended safeguarding biodiversity features by drawing up a Conservation Building Control Plan and Biodiversity Management Plan for the site.

It was not considered that the proposal was contrary to any relevant planning policy within the LDP, that the proposed development was appropriate for the site and that it would help achieve an objective of strategic importance.

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

Cllr Gareth A Roberts

- The proposal was of essential importance to the Service
- The existing provision was insufficient
- Supported the application

Cllr Menna Baines (not present at the meeting, but she had sent an e-mail message)

- 'No objection to the proposal - deemed it a necessary development'

c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application

#### **RESOLVED**

**To approve the application subject to conditions relating to the following:**

- 1. Time (five years)**
- 2. In accordance with the plans**
- 3. The recommendations of the Arboriculture Assessment and Method Statement and Ecological Appraisal must be followed.**
- 4. Welsh Water Condition to protect the sewerage system.**

#### Notes

1. Welsh Water
2. Natural Resources Wales
3. Land Drainage Unit

**6.3 APPLICATION NUMBER C22/1169/15/LL Llanberis Library, Ffordd Capel Coch, Llanberis**

Demolition of former library and construction of three new intermediate affordable dwellings.

Some Members had visited the site on 05-09-23

- a) The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that the application had already been discussed at a meeting of the Planning Committee held on 17 July 2023. At that time it had been resolved to defer the decision in order to conduct a site visit so that Members had an opportunity to see the site in the context of its location.

It was reported that it was a full application for the demolition of the former Llanberis library and the construction of three new 'intermediate' affordable dwellings in its place (two 2-bedroom semi-detached dwellings and one 3-bedroom detached dwelling). The library was closed in 2017 and the site, which was within the residential area of the Llanberis Local Service Centre as defined in the LDP, had been dormant since. The site was served by Ffordd Capel Coch, which also served Ysgol Dolbadarn. Reference was made to the footbridge over Afon Coch river towards the rear of the site, which connected with Glanrafon Estate - over the past few years flood alleviation work had been completed on the river banks as a result of significant flooding in 2012.

The development had been introduced by Cyngor Gwynedd as part of the 'Tŷ Gwynedd' scheme. The houses would be offered to buy or rent for an affordable price to local people.

Attention was drawn to the number of objections to the plan because parking issues already existed on Ffordd Capel Coch which caused ill-feeling amongst residents, and there was concern that the construction of three dwellings at this location would exacerbate the situation. In addition, there were concerns regarding the hazard to street users, including children who attended the nearby school, due to the increase in traffic.

Despite the concerns, the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal in principle although they had noted that they would not support the creation of on-street parking spaces. The officer stated that there was a private parking space for each new property in the plans and that space would remain for three cars to park on the road in front of the development. It was added that until recently, the site had been a public library that attracted traffic itself. Consequently, it was not considered that the development itself would exacerbate the on-street parking situation compared to what could be the case under the site's current lawful planning use. Similarly, it was not considered that the traffic caused by three dwellings would cause a greater risk to street users than the former library.

In the context of flooding concerns, a Flood Consequence Assessment (FCA) had been submitted with the application in response to initial observations from Natural Resources Wales (NRW). It was noted that the findings of the Flood Consequence Assessment and the modelling process that was followed confirmed that the development would comply with the requirements of the current TAN 15, specifically the criteria set by Appendix 1 of the TAN. In addition, the FCA proposed a series of alleviation measures to improve the resilience of the development to flooding.

As a result, the proposal was considered acceptable based on the ability to manage flood risk to the occupiers of the proposed dwellings, and that it would not cause added risk in other places. It was therefore considered that the application complied with the

requirements of Policies PS 5 and PS 6 and the content of the current TAN 15: Development and Flood Risk (2004).

In the context of the specialist information submitted regarding the flood risk, it was accepted that this development would not exacerbate the situation in terms of material planning matters compared with what could occur under the site's present lawful planning use. Indeed, it was considered that the proposal might offer an opportunity to improve the site's resilience to flood risk and introduce improvements in terms of matters such as visual amenities and biodiversity. It was noted that the proposal offered the opportunity to create affordable housing for local people on a brownfield site within the development boundary; it was an acceptable plan in principle, and it complied with relevant local and national planning policies.

b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application

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

- The site visit had been beneficial
- Previous use of the building as a library had created more traffic problems
- Welcomed affordable housing
  
- The design of the proposal did not reflect the area's industrial connection - why would Cyngor Gwynedd not select a more traditional design that would be in-keeping with the terraced houses?

**RESOLVED to approve with conditions:**

- 1. The development shall be commenced within five years**
- 2. Development to comply with the approved plans**
- 3. Condition to ensure that the houses remain permanently affordable**
- 4. Slate roof**
- 5. The recommendations of the Initial Ecological Assessment must be observed**
- 6. The recommendations of the Flooding Risk Assessment must be observed**
- 7. Welsh Water Condition**
- 8. A Welsh name must be given to the development**

Note: Welsh Water  
Sustainable Drainage

**6.4 APPLICATION NUMBER C23/0293/42/LL AROSFA, EDERN, PWLLHELI, LL53 8YU**

Full application for the demolition of existing structures and construction of a new dwelling and associated works

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that it was a full application to demolish existing structures and construct a new detached two-storey dwelling and associated works. An external balcony would be included on part of the dwelling's first floor on the south-eastern elevation, namely the elevation that would look away from any neighbouring property. The site was located within the development

boundary and within the Western Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. The application had been amended twice since it was originally submitted in response to observations received and following discussions with officers.

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee for a decision at the local member's request due to concern about the size of the proposed house and its proximity to other houses.

It was explained that the site in question had already been developed and, therefore, was considered as a brownfield site and was located within the development boundary of the village of Edern. The proposal, therefore, met the requirements of policies PS 5, PCYFF 1 and PS17 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan (LDP).

The requirements of policy TAI 15 noted that an appropriate level of affordable housing must be ensured in the plan's area. Depending on the scale of developments, a contribution towards affordable housing provision was expected in accordance with the threshold recognised for the county's settlements. In the case of the village of Edern, which had been identified as a rural/coastal/local village, the threshold was 2 or more units. As this proposal was for the provision of one new house only, it did not meet this threshold to consider affordable provision.

In the context of the visual amenities, currently, the site consisted of industrial-like sheds that were quite simple in design, which stood unnoticed within the plot. It was acknowledged that the proposed house would be larger in size than the existing buildings but in response to highlighted concerns, the building had been amended from what had been originally submitted. The new house was located within part of the site that was within the development boundary, and although this meant it was closer to the northern boundary of the site than it would have been should it have been pushed further into the site, it was not considered that its location within the site was unreasonable. The roof ridge height of the existing highest shed was 3.3m and the height of the ridge of the proposed roof would be 5.8m.

In the context of general and residential amenities, it was noted that the site was surrounded to the south-west, north and the north-west by dwellings with open lands extending past the southern/south-eastern boundary of the site. Elements of overlooking already existed due to the location of the existing buildings. There were trees/shrubs within the garden and nearby gardens reduced some of the impact. It was considered that a real effort had been made to reduce the impact of what had been originally submitted and it can be seen that the amendments responded to the concerns highlighted by planning officers. It was believed that the reduced height in one part of the building, contributed to the improvement and that the other changes, namely reducing the external balcony and changing some windows, improved the proposal in terms of the impact on neighbours.

Having considered all relevant matters including the local and national policies and guidance, as well as all the observations and objections received, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable

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

- That he had been born and bred in Edern and lived in Gorwel, Lôn Groesffordd.
- As there had been no consultation with neighbours before submitting the application, he had asked the opinion of thirteen closest neighbours of which a copy had been submitted to the committee.
- The main reasons for objecting were; negative impact of the house on the beauty and appearance of the village, impact of overshadowing and loss of privacy by overlooking the rear of the dwellings.
- The dwelling would have a negative impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents by overshadowing and loss of privacy by overlooking the rear of neighbouring houses.
- The neighbours of Dol Erw, Yr Hafod and Gorwel had a right to privacy on their rear elevation - felt strongly that the dwelling would substantially affect their right to a reasonable expectation of privacy at the rear of their houses. Although noting that obscure glass had been added to some windows on the first floor, this did not alleviate the infliction of losing privacy.
- From the ground floor of the house, it would be possible to see into the two bedrooms, kitchen, dining room and two attic rooms of Gorwel, as well as the entire rear garden.
- The location of the external door on the south-western elevation not only meant that residents of the dwelling would disturb the privacy of Gorwel residents, but anyone visiting the house would also disturb their privacy.
- The glass of windows in bedroom 4 or the landing window were not obscure, therefore, no effort had been made to reduce the negative impact on Yr Hafod and Dol Erw, while the windows were open or closed - changing the type of glass did not change the fact that we would be overlooked when windows were open.
- Overshadowing concerns had already been highlighted, disappointing that a dwelling shadow impact assessment had not been prepared. Not only concerned that the dwelling would overshadow the gardens, but due to the height of the house in comparison with Gorwel, Dol Erw and Hafod, the windows of at the back of the houses would be overshadowed.
- The scale, height and size of the dwelling would have a negative impact on the character, beauty and appearance of the village.
- Only a cross-section of the dwelling against Dol Erw and Schiehallion had been submitted. Although the ridge height of the house was slightly lower than Schiehallion, this was not the closest neighbour to the house.
- A request had been made on more than one occasion for a cross-section of the dwelling against the neighbouring houses on Lôn Groesffordd. Very disappointing that no effort had been made to prepare this.
- In addition, the majority would see the house from Lôn Groesffordd, the main road through the village.
- The ridge of the house would be much higher than over 93% of its closest neighbours on Lôn Groesffordd. Without a plan of the dwelling within the context of the village, it was not possible for closest neighbours, the planning department or Committee Councillors to assess the impact of the house on the village and the existing streetscape.
- It was noted that the plan indicated trees between the house and the elevation from Lôn Groesffordd. This did not reduce the negative impact of the house, because the trees would be bare for half the year. These were not evergreen trees.

- Should the elevation of the house within the context of Lôn Groesffordd be favourable to the application, why not include it?
  - Encouraged the Committee to support neighbours to request a real assessment of the impact of the dwelling on the beauty and appearance of the village and on the privacy of closest neighbours.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant made the following observations:
- He was born and bred from Edern, and he had been brought up there with his family. Had attended Ysgol Edern and Ysgol Uwchradd Botwnnog and had lived in Edern all his life. His children had also attended Ysgol Edern and Ysgol Uwchradd Botwnnog.
  - He was a local businessman who employed fifteen local people and collaborated with various other local businesses, and ensured that the Welsh language came first throughout the company.
  - Hard-working in the village - chair of the Edern playground committee.
  - Him and his family were eager to remain in their area and only wanted to construct one dwelling in order to have a home and wanted to raise a family here.
  - They had an advantage of having land within the development boundary of the village. Felt very strongly about remaining in his area as his parents were within reach as they grew older.
  - He was aware of the concerns and complaints that had been submitted and had attempted to respond positively to the observations by re-designing the plans.
  - He did not want to cause an argument - the site was within the development boundary and he was seeking to design a home that would not disturb others.
  - That privacy was important for all.
- d) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- That a percentage of Edern residents was fervently in favour of the application but there was discontent amongst others with a petition that had been collected as the proposal affected the privacy of closest neighbours and the size of the proposal.
  - That adaptations to the plans had been welcomed.
  - He was in favour of the applicant's need to have a new house in Edern, the village where he was born and bred, but there was a need to be fair and consider the opinion and observations of nearby residents.
  - "It was believed that the development in its amended form was now acceptable in terms of its impact on the amenities of nearby residents" - would the officer state this if they lived nearby? ...in the shadow of such a prominent house that would create a detrimental impact on the privacy of neighbours?
  - If consideration would be given to approve the application, proposed a condition to 'move' the house slightly to the south - meaning that 95% would be within the boundary and the rest would be slightly on the boundary. Saw no reasons for the possibility of doing this.
  - This would be a compromise to alleviate 'real' concerns and be fair to everyone.

It was proposed and seconded to conduct a site visit

**RESOLVED: To defer in order to conduct a site visit**

The meeting commenced at 13:00 and concluded at 14:20.

---

**CHAIR**