
PLANNING COMMITTEE 17/10/16

Present: Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones (Chair)

Councillors: Endaf Cooke, Gwen Griffith, Siân Wyn Hughes (Substitute), Eric Merfyn Jones, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams and John Wyn Williams.

Others invited: Councillor Anwen J. Davies, Lesley Day, Gweno Glyn, E. Selwyn Griffiths, Gareth Wyn Griffith, Elfed Williams and R H Wyn Williams (Local members).

Also in attendance: Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), Glyn Llewelyn Gruffudd (Senior Development Control Officer), Rhys Roberts (Development Control Officer), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Glynda O'Brien (Members' Support Officer).

Apologies: Councillors Elwyn Edwards and Simon Glyn.

1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

(a) The following members declared a personal interest for the reasons noted:

- Councillor Gruffydd Williams in item 5.1 on the agenda (application no. C16/0310/46/LL) as he was courting the applicant's sister.
- Councillor June Marshall in items 5.3 and 5.4 on the agenda (planning applications nos. C13A/0156/11/LL and C16/0440/11/CR)) as she was friends with many of the neighbours.
- Councillor W. Tudor Owen in items 5.5 a 5.6 on the agenda (application nos. C15/0808/20/LL and C15/0807/20/CR) as he was a member of the Caernarfon Harbour Trust.
- Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones in Item 5.12 on the agenda (application no. C16/0744/17/LL as she was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.
- Councillor Michael Sol Owen, in item 5.12 on the agenda, (planning application no. C16/0744/17/LL), as he was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.
- Councillor John Wyn Williams in item 5.12 on the agenda (application no. C16/0744/17/LL as he was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.

The members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests and they withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the item noted.

(b) The following members declared that they were local members in relation to the items noted:

- Councillor Anwen Davies, (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0410/33/LL)

- Councillor Lesley Day (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to items 5.3 and 5.4 on the agenda (planning applications nos. C13/0156/11/LL and C16/0440/11/CR)
- Councillor Gareth Wyn Griffith (who was not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.5 and 5.6 on the agenda (planning application nos. C15/0808/20/LL, C15/0807/20/CR)
- Councillor Elfed Williams, (who was not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.7 on the agenda (Planning Application no. C16/0329/18/LL)
- Councillor Selwyn Griffiths (who was not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.9 and 5.10 on the agenda, (planning applications nos. C16/0704/44/LL and C16/0732/44/LL)
- Councillor Gruffydd Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.11 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0743/42/LL)
- Councillor Eric M Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.12 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0744/17/LL)
- Councillor Gweno Glyn (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.13 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0849/32/LL)
- Councillor R. H. Wyn Williams (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.14 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0931/39/LL)

The members withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussions on the applications in question and did not vote on these matters.

(c) The Development Control Manager declared a personal interest in item 5.7 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0329/18/LL) as her cousin who lived opposite the site had opposed the application.

The officer was of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest, and withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the item noted.

2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this Committee, that took place on 26 September 2016, as a true record.

3. 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 aspects of the policies.

RESOLVED

1. Application no. C116/0310/46/LL – Penclawdd, Llangwnnadi

Extension to touring caravan site to include extension of land and increase numbers from 8 to 22 touring units together with erecting a new amenity block

The Development Control Manager reported that having prepared the report the applicant's agent had made a request to defer consideration of the application in order to submit further information.

Resolved: **To defer the application.**

2. Application Number C16/0410/33/LL – Glanrhyd Land, Mynydd Nefyn

Construction of shed for storing materials and machinery in connection with a construction business.

- (a) The Committee was reminded by the Development Control Officer that the application was deferred at the Planning Committee in July 2016 in order to give the applicant an opportunity to try to regulate the use of the existing shed and yard, which were used for the builder's business rather than for agricultural use as originally approved. It was noted that the applicant had now established and authorised the use of the existing yard by submitting a request for a legal use certificate as a builder's yard; this was permitted on 19.09.16.

The proposal was noted to erect a 225m² shed at the rear of the existing yard near the property of Glanrhyd, Mynydd Nefyn to store materials and machinery in connection with the applicant's building business. The application was submitted to the Committee at the local member's request. The shed would be finished with a dark green box profile roof and Yorkshire panel timber wall cladding.

The site was in open countryside and within a Landscape Conservation Area and close to the AONB with an unclassified county highway serving the site.

There was an existing shed on the site that was approved in 2003 for agricultural use. The proposed shed would be located further back to the rear of the yard and visible from the county road, between the existing shed and huts in the property's curtilage.

Attention was drawn to the planning history, enquiries, policies and the response to the consultations that were all noted in the report.

- (b) The Local Member (not a Member of this Planning Committee), supported the application and noted that the applicant by now had received a legal use certificate stating that the use as a shed/workshop and builder's yard had been undertaken for over ten years. It was further noted that the proposal would give an opportunity for a young family to remain in the countryside and would be a boost to the local school and economy.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- (ch) A Member noted that any business developments were to be welcomed in the countryside.

Resolved: To approve the application in accordance with the following conditions:

1. 5 years
2. In accordance with the plans
3. Shed to be used in connection with the existing business only
4. Finish
5. Landscaping near the entrance in the next planting season.

3. Application number C13/0156/11/LL – 7, Glandwr Terrace, Bangor

Demolition of an existing rear extension and the erection of a part two-storey and part single-storey extension to the rear of the property, along with the provision of French doors and erection of new 1.8m fence near the right of way

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the property was a three storey, end house in a row of seven listed dwellings (Grade II). It was noted that the proposal was to demolish part of the existing two-storey rear section and re-build new sections and demolish the one storey building and re-erect a one storey extension in its place. The Planning Committee visited the site in June. It was noted that no internal adaptations formed part of the application and reference was made to the full details within the report before Committee. Reference was made to late information received from the agent submitting a report by a structural engineer in order to justify the demolition work.

It was noted that the site was located within the development boundaries of the City of Bangor with an unclassified road running nearby and an access road to the back with a public right of way leading along the front of the terrace and along the side of the site.

Based on the information in paragraphs 5.3 - 5.7, it was not considered that the extension was excessive in terms of size, or that it dominated any nearby property. It was not considered that the new windows to the first floor of the extension would cause any overlooking of other properties and the slate roofs and materials to the external walls were acceptable.

Following a period of public consultation, several objections were received and a response was given to these within the report in paragraphs 5.12 - 5.14.

It was considered that the principle of demolishing on the scale shown as part of the application and then extend/re-build the rear extension was acceptable from the perspective of local and national policies despite the disagreement in views from the statutory consultees and officers and it was considered that it would be beneficial to receive justification for the work and confirmation and clear reasons for demolishing sections of the building.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the agent had submitted a report from a structural engineer to justify the demolition work but it was not considered that the evidence gave sufficient explanation regarding the structural condition of the walls and why it was not possible to maintain them as they were. Therefore, two sets of different types of information had been received from the agent - first dealing with sustainability and energy matters and the second in the form of a structural engineer's report, however, it was not clear from the report received if the walls were dangerous or merely not good enough to support the proposed extensions. Therefore, the planning officers had not been totally convinced that the submitted information gave sufficient justification for demolition.

Should the above-mentioned justification for the demolition work be acceptable, it was considered that the size, design and materials of the new extension including the fence would also be acceptable and in accordance with the relevant policies. However, the proposal was not considered acceptable in its current form as no robust information had been submitted to justify the demolition work and why the existing listed building could not be adapted as it was. Consequently, the planning officers' recommendation was to refuse the application.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the objector noted that he welcomed the Planning Department's recommendation to refuse the application and the following main points were noted:
- That Glandwr Terrace had been recognised as having national importance by being designated as a Grade II listed building and listing did not mean a grand property but

humble buildings such as Glandwr Terrace to ensure a correct representation of national history.

- Glandwr Terrace was a good example and represented a time or period when there was increasing wealth linked to maritime trading and the slate industry.
- That the terrace made a significant contribution to the character of the Garth area and the Pier setting.
- There was no need or any reason to demolish a section of number 7 as the structure had been large enough for generations.
- That it was important to retain the front of the building as all of Number 7 had been listed not just the front.

(c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:

- The proposed development would assist to create an appropriate home for the current and future needs of the owners.
- That the condition of the existing external building was serious and was bulging
- There were no appropriate foundations and the walls were unsafe
- The extension was not fit for purpose without significant expenditure that could not be justified
- The proposal did not entail substantial demolition work, approximately 20% and this would not impact on the character of the property
- That the proposal offered a suitable solution and it was a good design that was in keeping with a listed building and the wider context
- There were no firm reasons to refuse the application and a plea was made to the Committee to show their support for the proposal to the Planning Inspector.

(ch) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and he supported its refusal for the following reasons:

- That families had maintained their homes carefully and they were in keeping with traditional design
- The main features of the terrace had remained whole
- Since submitting the original planning application CADW had acknowledged that Glandwr Terrace was of national importance
- CADW had also recommended in strong terms that sections of Garth ward should be earmarked, including Glandwr Terrace, for conservation area status
- The proposals comprised significant alterations to the back of the property including the demolition of a substantial section of the property to be replaced with a larger structure with a larger footprint that would extend beyond the current line of the terrace gable-end
- There were a proposals to change the roof line
- There was no robust justification regarding the alterations and reference was made to the specific policies of Gwynedd Council and national policies to this end
- The proposal would have a detrimental impact on the existing uniformity of the rear of each of the seven properties in the terrace
- The proposed extension did not offer an acceptable reduction and it was not in keeping with the garden design and the Member was of the view that it would create a detrimental impact to the listed building
- The fence would be an eyesore and prevent views and access to the beach steps located at the gable-end of the property.
- A plea was made for the Committee to approve the refusal of the application

(d) In response to the observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the application dated back to 2013 and at the time the building had not been listed. Observations had been received from statutory bodies to the listed application and therefore these were vitally important in the context of the application. He was of the view that 20% of demolition work on a listed building was considered substantial and although a late report had been received from a structural engineer the planning officers, following further assessment, continued to be of the opinion that the information did not justify the need for demolition work on a listed building.

(dd) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

(e) The following points were noted in favour of the refusal:

- that Glandwr Terrace was an important part of Bangor's history and certainly for a worldwide site designation regarding the slate industry
- that all the terrace was listed and their backs were just as important as the front of the buildings
- the importance of retaining the structure of the buildings as they were
- that attention had to be given to the observations received from statutory bodies who specialise in the field

(f) A member noted that he did not support the refusal of the application due to the risk that the building was unsafe and should be demolished and re-built and therefore it was difficult to refuse as it was not contrary to policy.

(ff) In response to a query regarding deferral of the application to receive more information, the Senior Manager Planning Service explained that the contents of the engineering report did not justify demolition and therefore there was no reason to defer the application again.

Resolved: To refuse as no robust information was submitted to justify the demolition work and why the existing listed building could not be adapted in its existing form in accordance with the advice given in Welsh Office Circular 61/96 Planning and the Historic Environment: Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas and Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales.

4. Application number C16/0440/11/CR - 7, Glandwr Terrace, Bangor

Demolition of an existing rear extension and the erection of a part two-storey and part single-storey extension to the rear of the property

(a) The Development Control Manager reported that the application before the committee was for the same site as the previous application in item 3. However, this time this was a listed building application for the partial demolition of an existing two-storey rear extension and the rear single-storey extension, along with the erection of a new single-storey extension on the same site and the erection of a fence along the side of the house. It was noted that an appeal had been registered as no decision had been made regarding the listed building and therefore it was explained that the Planning Committee would not have the right to make a formal resolution as this would be made by the Planning Inspectorate. However, it was explained that it would be necessary for the Planning Committee to give guidance to planning officers regarding what type of decision they would have taken if the application was before them and this was in order to deal with the appeal on behalf of the Council. Following the receipt of the Committee's confirmation the planning officers would then provide an appeal statement to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

Attention was drawn that the application details were similar to the previous application in item 3 and reference was made to the contents of the description and the full responses within the report before Committee.

It was added that the agent had submitted a late structural engineering report to the Planning Department. As a result of the concerns regarding the conclusions of the report and the lack of total clarity if it was possible to support or strengthen the walls without their demolition and if the report was based on the condition of the walls as they currently were or on the condition of the walls to support the new extension.

Consequently, it was explained that the planning officers had not been convinced that the response fully alleviated the concerns noted in the report. It was also intended to submit an engineering report to the Planning Inspectorate as part of the appeal information.

It was further noted that the principle could be acceptable but currently the required information was not acceptable in order to come to a conclusion that the whole proposal was acceptable.

In order to enable officers to deal with the appeal the Committee was requested to confirm its stance on the application and authorise the officers to submit the appeal case on behalf of the Council. It was recommended that the Committee delegated powers to officers to deal with the appeal for a lack of decision and to deal with any information that came to hand during the appeal and confirm that the Council's view would be to recommend dismissing the appeal due to the lack of clear justification for the demolition work.

(b) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:

- That CADW had recognised that Glandwr Terrace was of national importance and listed in May 2013 and had also recommended in strong terms that sections of Garth ward should be earmarked, including Glandwr Terrace, for conservation area status
- That CADW had stated that the terrace was of special historic interest with its links with maritime and the slate industry of north-west Wales.
- That Glandwr Terrace was located within the heritage bay of a nominated Heritage Site that Porth Penrhyn was part of it and it was noted that Glandwr Terrace was clearly visible from the site
- The relevant policies of Gwynedd Council regarding listed buildings had to be taken into consideration and reference was made to these policies
- Concern that approximately over a quarter of Glandwr Terrace would be demolished and there was no way that demolition and building an extension on a different footprint could be seen as an improvement for the terrace
- CADW stated that the relationship with the beach steps was a vital part of its design and configuration
- That the access to the foreshore dated from a period pre 1948 and was part of a curtilage and therefore it made no sense to close it
- That experts such as the Victorian Society and the Ancient Monuments Society had very clear views and refused the demolition of any part of the structure in the same way as some of the residents of Garth ward including the other residents of Glandwr Terrace
- There was concern that a precedent would be set if the listed building application was approved and there was a danger that all listed buildings would be vulnerable
- A plea was made to the Planning Committee to refuse permission

(c) A proposal was made, seconded and voted upon in favour of the officers' recommendation.

Resolved: To delegate the right to officers to deal with the appeal regarding the lack of a decision and to deal with any information that comes to hand during the appeal and to confirm that the current view of the Council was to recommend refusal of the application as no robust information was submitted to justify the demolition work and why the existing listed building could not be adapted in its existing form in accordance with the advice given in Welsh Office Circular 61/96 Planning and the Historic Environment: Historic Buildings and Conservation Areas.

5. Application number C15/0807/20/CR – Menai Marina, Hen Gei Llechi, Felinheli

Retrospective application to retain a pontoon within the quay.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that it was a retrospective application to retain a pontoon within the quay that was located on the northern wall of the harbour and linked to three locations which would allow the pontoon to be raised with the tide. It was noted that the site was part of the existing marina and the harbour wall was a Grade II listed structure.

Attention was drawn to the objections and the engineering report that stated that the installation of the pontoon was unlikely to have any detrimental effect from a harbour structural engineering standpoint.

Following the committee's resolution in September 2016, the objectors were given an opportunity to provide and submit their own engineering report and it did not appear from their report that the wall was in a poor state of repair nor was it under any threat from the pontoon. In the report's conclusion it was suggested that a condition be imposed to monitor the wall regularly, as a fair mitigation measure. In addition, the opinion of Gwynedd Consultancy on the report was received and it was confirmed that it had been undertaken by a recognised company and the recommendations were fair. It was not considered that the contents of the new report by the objectors had submitted any new evidence and therefore the recommendation had not changed from the previous recommendations.

It was explained that the application was now subject of an appeal for a lack of decision and in order to enable officers to deal with the appeal the Committee was requested to confirm its stance on the application and authorise the officers to submit the appeal case on behalf of the Council. It was recommended that the Committee delegate powers to officers to deal with the appeal for a lack of decision and to confirm that the Council's view would be to recommend approval of the application with a condition and a note to regularly monitor the condition of the wall.

- (b) On behalf of the area's residents, the Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and noted the following main points:
- The importance that Committee members were aware of all the contents of the engineering report
 - That several people opposed the application
 - The wall was over 100 years old and its condition was unknown
 - Although various reports had been submitted it was felt that no full survey of the wall had been undertaken
 - The area's residents did not object to all the pontoons, however, they objected to this type that was attached with brackets to the wall
 - An e-mail had been received from the applicant's agent stating that he was willing to remove the pontoon during winter from 1 November to 1 March and in addition he was prepared to conduct an annual visual inspection
 - It should be ensured that the condition stated regular monitoring

- There was concern regarding public safety if there were any problems with the pontoon
- (c) In response, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted the concerns of the member and local residents, however, he drew attention to the fact that the application was in the hands of the Planning Inspectorate. The Committee was reminded that the application had been submitted for over 12 months and had been deferred several times to receive reports. Stemming from all the reports, it was stated that there was nothing to state that the development would exacerbate the situation in terms of the structural credibility of the harbour wall. It was stressed to the Committee that the application should be dealt with based on the contents of the evidence before them.
- (ch) The planning officers' recommendation was proposed and seconded.
- (d) During the ensuing discussion, the following concerns were highlighted:
- That any new development should be sustainable and had to work, however, in this case the lifespan of the wall was unknown
 - It was felt that the Committee was on shaky ground with this application bearing in mind the contents of the ARUP report
 - Several members noted that they were not convinced that the development would be sustainable
 - There was concern regarding public safety
- (dd) In response to the concerns highlighted above, the Senior Planning Service Manager explained that the reports stated that it was unlikely that there would be any additional impact on the wall structure as a result of the pontoon. It was further noted that confirmation had been received that the applicant would remove the pontoon over the winter months.
- (d) Whilst understanding the concerns, the Senior Solicitor explained that civil responsibilities outside the planning system fell on landowners and that the Committee took decisions on planning based on the evidence submitted. Although the reports were superficial, evidence before them stated that there was currently no impact to be seen and it was added that it was not possible to predict what may occur in years to come.

Resolved: To delegate powers to officers to deal with the appeal for a lack of decision and to confirm that the Council's view would be to recommend approval of the application in accordance with the plans submitted and a note to regularly monitor the condition of the wall.

6. Application number C15/0807/20/CR – Menai Marina, Hen Gei Llechi, Felinheli

Retrospective application to retain a pontoon within the quay.

- (a) The Development Control Manager reported that the application before the committee was a retrospective listed building application to retain a pontoon within the quay and in the same way as the previous application in item 5, as this application was also subject to appeal due to the lack of decision, the committee was requested for the right for officers to act on the Council's behalf by confirming their stance regarding the application. It was therefore recommended that the Committee delegate powers to officers to deal with the appeal for a lack of decision and to confirm that the Council's view would be to recommend approval of the application with a conditions and a note to regularly monitor the condition of the wall.

- (b) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) noted that the report was unclear regarding the safety of the wall and the need. If the application were to be approved a note should be included that the applicant should regularly monitor the wall.
- (c) The planning officers' recommendation was proposed and seconded.

Resolved: To delegate powers to officers to deal with the appeal for a lack of decision and to confirm that the Council's view would be to recommend approval of the application in accordance with the plans submitted and a note to regularly monitor the condition of the wall.

7. Application number C16/0329/18/LL - Land adjacent to the Post Office, Clwt y Bont, Caernarfon

Construction of three two-storey detached dwellings and associated developments.

- (a) The Development Control Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that the application had been before the Planning Committee twice already and an inspection visit had been conducted. It was explained that the proposal was to erect three two-storey dwellings on a brownfield site within the development boundary of Clwt y Bont. The application site had been used in the past mainly as a car park for the Post Office over the road (which was now closed). It appeared that the site was created by means of materials being in-filled in the past to create a level platform approximately 60m x 30m with steep slopes falling from the land on three sides.

Reference was made to matters concerning amenities as seen in paragraphs 5.11 to 5.23 of the report where matters such as the visual impact, impact on privacy, concerns regarding unstable land and biodiversity issues were considered and the conclusion was that the proposed development was acceptable in terms of these matters subject to the conditions proposed in Section 7 of the report.

Bearing in mind that this was a brownfield site within the development boundary, it was noted that the principle of developing the site was supported by the Unitary Development Plan. However, Policy CH4 stated that it should be ensured that a proportion of all units proposed to be built within villages should be affordable units, unless it would be inappropriate to provide affordable housing on the site. There was a detailed reference to the matter in paragraphs 5.1 to 5.8 of the report.

Viability Calculations were provided with the application that indicated that the scheme would not be viable with an affordable element. It was noted that the Council's Property Unit had agreed that the building costs submitted were reasonable and the Joint Planning Policy Unit had used a standard methodology, they and other councils use, to assess the viability of proposed housing developments, and they agreed that the scheme would not be economically viable should it include an element of affordable housing.

Following the discussion at the previous Committee, the Policy Unit confirmed their calculations and they believed by considering the evidence before them, that it would not be reasonable to refuse the application on the grounds of a lack of affordable provision. It was also important to bear in mind that, due to the restrictions of the site in relation to highways access, that it was not possible to develop the site to its full potential, the site was large enough to possibly include five or six units and then the affordable element would certainly become more viable. However, considering the site's restrictions and the evidence before them, it was not deemed that there was justification to request that one of the houses should be affordable in a scheme of this scale. It was considered that the development proposed was acceptable in principle and as it was unlikely to have an unacceptable detrimental effect on the amenities of the local area that the application should be approved.

(b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application for the following reasons:

- House prices were not affordable to local people bearing in mind the area's low wages
- There was no reference to the cost of buying the site
- Concern about the building density of the site
- There were figures and detailed studies of house prices yet in paragraph 5.6 it was stated that it was not possible to get specific information for the Clwt y Bont and Deiniolen area and it was therefore questioned how the application could be fully assessed
- That scrap comprising old cars, buses etc. had been buried on the land and any prospective developer would have to excavate and extract tonnes of rubble from the site
- That the building work would have an impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents
- There would be increasing traffic on a narrow road and there was concern regarding child safety especially as there were no suitable places for lorries to turn
- Nuisance that would include noise, dust and darkening of residents' houses
- Whilst the Planning Department stated that the negative impact on residents during the building work should not be considered, the member felt that if this Council was serious in its campaign to implement the principles of "Ffordd Gwynedd" then every decision should be made by placing the people of Gwynedd central to everything and therefore the only decision that could be made was to refuse the application.
- That sites had already received consent at Clwt y Bont that respond to the needs of Deiniolen and Clwt y Bont

(c) In response to the above observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager explained that the application had been deferred for decision previously in order to receive more details regarding affordable housing and reference was made to the specific paragraphs in the report. It was recognised that residents were aware of the site's history and the development costs reflected this type of site. It was confirmed that this application had been checked by the Property Unit and the Council's Joint Policy Unit and there was no justification in this case to demand affordable housing. In addition, there was evidence that there was a general need for housing and therefore there was no evidence to refuse the application. There was a comment that the residential amenities of residents needed to be considered and this would be addressed in condition 6 of the planning permission to develop the site and that the application was in compliance with the relevant policies.

(ch) Proposed and seconded to approve the application.

(d) The following points were noted against approving the application:

- The road was narrow
- Impact on the area's amenities
- Affordable housing

(dd) The following points were noted in favour of the application:

- The Community Council did not object to the application
- There was no objection from the Council's Transportation Department in relation to an increase in traffic.

(e) In response to additional enquiries from individual Members, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted:

- that the frustrating nature of the road network was limited to the density of housing and this is why more houses cannot be developed on the site.
- there would be conditions within the consent to address concerns regarding traffic increase
- there would be a condition regarding the building method and a condition could be imposed to inspect the site in the context of land pollution
- in terms of safety, the building work would be addressed within the building regulations

Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:

1. **Time**
2. **Comply with plans**
3. **Slate roofs**
4. **Details of external materials must be submitted and approved**
5. **Welsh Water Condition**
6. **A Construction Method Statement must be submitted and approved, which would include**
 - **Details of any engineering work involving changes to ground levels**
 - **Plans for dealing with the boundaries of the site**
 - **Plan for eradicating Japanese knotweed**
 - **A landscaping and tree planting scheme including control details of these features in the long-term**
7. **A desktop investigation must be submitted to assess the pollution risk. If the desk-top inspection indicated that further action was needed, any precautionary and/or remedial measures would have to be agreed prior to commencing work on the development.**
8. **No site clearance work during the bird nesting season**
9. **Highway conditions**
10. **A suitable fence must be constructed around the garden of the house to the south-east.**
11. **Withdrawal of permitted development rights.**

8. Application number C16/0848/00/LL – Barmouth Toilets, Marine Parade, Barmouth

Application to convert unused public conveniences into a dwelling house, to include raising the height of the existing roof and external alterations.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that this was a proposal to convert unused former public toilets into a dwelling house located in the centre of the coastal town of Barmouth with a primary school east of the site. The school's playing field was at the rear and northern boundary of the application site. West of the site was a pavement and an unclassified county highway, with the promenade and the beach across the road. This building was previously used as public toilets prior to their closure in 1997, and they were sold by the Council in July 2015. There was a mixture of land use locally which comprises residential dwellings, hotels and a primary school. It was noted that this site was located within the development boundary for the town of Barmouth and within the Mawddach Landscape of Historic Interest. Several responses had been received to the consultation with the proposal satisfying the requirements of transportation, Welsh Water and Natural Resources Wales. Several objections were raised

by the public including considerations such as the proximity of the building to the school playing field, lack of amenity land surrounding the building, the was building unsuitable for conversion and that the standard of the design was unacceptable together with other matters discussed in the report. There was also correspondence which welcomed the development as an improvement to the current untidy condition of the site.

It was emphasised that in terms of a planning decision it was important to bear in mind that this was an application to convert an existing building into a dwelling within the development boundary of a local centre as defined by the Unitary Development Plan. Attention was drawn to policy CH11 of the Plan that specifically relates to proposals to convert buildings within the development boundaries for residential use. Consideration was given to the criteria of that policy and it was deemed that the proposal satisfied each of these criteria. It was noted that policy C4 was supportive to the adaptation of buildings for appropriate new uses.

In terms of amenities, the site was detached, and of a sufficient distance from any other residential property so as not to have a direct impact on them. In addition, it was considered that restoring and reusing the building would present an opportunity to tidy it up and prevent its further deterioration, thus, safeguarding and improving the quality and condition of the site and protecting the area's visual amenities in general.

It was noted that this was an application to re-develop a building within the development boundary for an appropriate use for the location and therefore it was recommended that the application be approved with conditions as listed in the report.

(b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the objector, on behalf of governing body and parents of Ysgol y Traeth stated that they objected the application on the grounds of:

1. Amenities - altering the building would impair on the children's amenities to play as the back of the building bordered the School's playing field
2. Design - that the proposal did not respect the area in terms of scale and it would be higher than the existing building and would be out of character
3. Materials - the proposal did not safeguard the area's visual character as the applicant would use metal and not blue slate on the roof bearing in mind that the School, a hotel and nearby houses had high quality slate roofing
4. Second homes - that the application lead to an increase in the number of second homes in a community where they already formed a high proportion of the housing stock.
5. Risk of Flooding - that Natural Resources Wales had designated that the area was highly vulnerable in terms of flooding and reference was made to the serious impact of flooding in 2014 in the Barmouth area

(c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:

- That the contents of her Architect's letter alleviated the majority of the concerns
- She worked over the whole of Wales and the main aim was to buy a property to live in and she did not intend to make any profit from it
- She had conducted extensive discussions with the Planning Department when developing the plans to ensure that all planning issues had received full attention
- That the materials to be used on the building had been suggested by the Planning Department as part of the planning process
- She had contacted the Head of Ysgol y Traeth and was willing to continue with any further discussions
- That she had committed to buying a parking permit as part of the Council's Parking Scheme in order to alleviate any parking concerns

- She was aware that the property backed onto playing fields, as was the Council at the time the property was sold, and this was why the Council had noted that it was not possible to install larger sized windows at the back of the property and she had focused the design to be in keeping with the local area
- No objection had been received from the Town Council or Natural Resources Wales in relation to flooding, however, a minor amendment had been made to the design by raising the floor level
- Whilst acknowledging that the building was small it was sufficient for a one bedroom house
- Her wish was to transform an unused building that was an eyesore into a dwelling before it got into a worse condition and deteriorated
- She was more than willing to meet local residents to ensure that everyone was happy with the building work and she wished to be part of the community

(ch) In response to the objector's concerns, the Development Control Manager noted that these had received full consideration and had been noted in the contents of the report. It was further noted that the proposed development would make good use of the building.

(d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

(dd) In response to observations made by individual Members, the Development Control Manager noted:

- In terms of concerns regarding flooding, that the floor level of the property should be a specific height and this would be subject to an appropriate condition. Natural Resources Wales had no objection.
- The building could not cope with a slate roof and the intention was to keep it as similar as possible to the existing property.

Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:

- 1. Commence the development within five years of permission date**
- 2. In accordance with submitted plans;**
- 3. Materials to be agreed in writing prior to the commencement of the development;**
- 4. Level of the development's finished floor to be no lower than 6.53 AOD,**
- 5. No windows on the back/western elevation of the building and none to be installed in this elevation in the future;**
- 6. No net increase in surface water to be disposed of into the public sewer;**
- 7. Removal of permitted development rights.**

9. Application number C16/0704/44/LL - Land adjacent to the former Spar Store, Morfa Bychan

Application for the erection of two houses.

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted the main elements regarding the application. It was noted that this was a full application to erect 2 new dormer bungalows within a site that was previously used as a formal car park attached to a nearby shop and before that, as a garage. Attention was drawn to the detailed plans that indicated that both properties would have three bedrooms

and the total floor area would be approximately 190m² and 7m high to the apex. Externally the walls would be finished with a pebble dash finish and natural slate roofs.

The site was within the village's development boundary and had already been developed with existing residential dwellings to the side and rear of the site. A public road runs past the front of the site with a road leading to an estate of residential houses past the side with a shop on the other side of this road.

The application was submitted to the Committee in light of receiving three or more correspondences that object to the recommendation. Reference was made to the concerns stated and noted within the report.

In the report it was seen that a full assessment had been made of all the relevant matters including compliance with policies as well as the objections received. The proposal was not considered to be unacceptable and was suitable for the site; it was in keeping with the general elevations in the area and made good use of the existing empty site. It was recommended to approve the application in accordance with the conditions noted.

(b) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) stated that he had no objection to the proposal and he noted the following main points:

- Reduction in traffic to the highway as the land was used in the past as a car park
- Better use of land having been developed

(c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:

1. **Time**
2. **Comply with plans**
3. **Materials / slate**
5. **Highways**
6. **Drainage**
7. **Finished floor level details**
8. **Party wall note**
9. **Opaque glass**
10. **Conduct a pollution investigation of the site.**
11. **Removal of rights to include additional windows**
12. **Protect the velux windows' setting on the rear roofs**

10. Application number C16/0732/44/LL - Plot 59, Tan y Foel, Borth y Gest

Re-submission with amendments of applications refused under C15/1033/44/LL, C16/0144/44/LL and C16/0313/44/LL to erect a three bedroom property.

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that this was a re-submission of a full application that had been previously refused to erect a detached property with an integrated garage and new vehicular access. An amended application was submitted that included three bedrooms. The application was amended by reducing the overall size of the proposed building as well as removing some of the features. It was noted that the current plan indicated that the width of the building was 10.7m compared to 11.6m and 12.3m as refused previously, and the height was also reduced to 6.7m from the previous 6.9m and 7.6m.

It was noted that the principle of erecting the house was acceptable as the site was within the development boundary of the village of Borth-y-gest and outline permission had been approved in the past to erect a new house.

Attention was drawn to the fact that consistent amendments had been made as a result of the previous refusals in response to the planning authority's concerns.

It was recognised that concerns had been highlighted regarding this application that were consistent with the objections submitted with the previous applications. Full consideration has been given to all the relevant planning matters submitted.

It was believed that the proposal was now acceptable based on the amendments made and the reduction in the size of the proposed building and the site had already been considered suitable for residential development by the approval of an earlier application.

It was recommended that the application should be approved with the conditions as noted in the report.

(b) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following points:

- That he objected the previous application due to the size of the house, however, because of the amendment to reduce its size, he was of the view that he could now not object
- Whilst accepting that there were concerns locally regarding the quality of the land these concerns had been addressed in the report before them
- The land behind the site was steep and prior to commencement of the development it had to be ensured that there would be no land slippage
- It could not be refused as the development complied with the relevant policies
- The member was glad to see that condition 9 (withdrawal of PD rights) had been included in the conditions to ensure that the site would not be extended having received planning permission

(c) Regarding safeguarding the land at the rear of the site, the Development Control Manager confirmed that it would be possible to impose a condition to draw the applicant's attention to the concern via building regulations

Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:

1. **Time**
2. **Compliance with plans**
3. **Materials / slate**
4. **To submit and agree on a Building Control Plan**
5. **Protecting trees**
6. **Highways**
7. **Opaque glass**
8. **Finished floor levels**
9. **Removal of PD rights**
10. **Note on Party Wall Act**

Note: to draw the applicant's attention to the possibility of requiring a supporting wall at the back

11. Application Number C16/0743/42/LL – Glan y Môr, Nefyn

Construction of a two-storey side extension and construction of front porch

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the application was to erect a two-storey extension at the side of the existing house with a porch in the front to take the place of a flat roof extension and existing porch. It was proposed to demolish these structures and erect a new extension to provide additional living space. The roof of the extension would be set down from the ridge of the existing roof and would be finished with a natural slate roof.

It was noted that the site was outside the development boundary and in an open and prominent location on Nefyn beach and within the Heritage Coast and the Llŷn Historic Landscape. The property was connected to the Hendafarn property on the southern side which was a Grade II listed building. On the other side, the northern side, in very close proximity is Hafod y Môr dwelling.

Attention was drawn to the observations received during the consultation period in Section 4 of the report and it was noted that the statutory bodies were satisfied with the proposal although some consideration was given to biodiversity and flooding issues. Objections had been received from the public, such as:

- The visual impact, especially on the listed building with the use of inappropriate materials such as UpVC windows
- Concern about access for carrying out maintenance to the gable-end of the adjacent Hafod y Môr property

Attention was drawn to the fact that the property in question had an interesting architectural character and that the main elevation had unique features. It was considered that the scale, size, form and density of the proposed extension were acceptable and in keeping with the existing property. Given that there was currently a flat roof extension on the site, it was not considered that erecting a two-storey extension in its place would significantly impact the views of the site that the public currently have nor was it likely to have a detrimental impact on the character of the designated landscapes.

It was not clear from the application what was proposed as an external finish for the extension walls, however, bearing in mind the sensitivity of the site, it was deemed that a condition should be imposed to ensure an appropriate finish, such as a white render at this location.

In terms of the attached listed building, the extension would not adjoin the listed building or lead to the loss of important historical features. The proposed design would ensure that the extension appeared as subordinate to Glan y Môr, neither imposing on the property nor on the adjacent listed building.

In terms of the impact on the amenities of neighbours at Hafod y Môr, the new extension would more or less be constructed exactly on the footprint of the existing extension and therefore it was not considered that the proposal would be an over-development of the curtilage. There were no windows on the Hafod y Môr gable end, therefore, there was no concern about privacy. Despite the observations of the owners, matters concerning access arrangements for the maintenance of a private property were not planning considerations.

Having weighed up the proposal against the policies of the development plan, it was considered that the proposed two-storey extension was acceptable and it was recommended to approve the application in accordance with the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:
- That the applicant was Welsh and had bought the property in order to return to the area

- The property had stood empty for many years and had deteriorated and they were anxious to renew it internally and externally to comprise a new roof and a small extension that was less than 10% of the floor area
 - The extension was be in keeping with the property's architecture and the property opposite
 - It was proposed to place a Welsh slate roof on the extension and the materials would match the property
 - That discussions had taken place with the Planning Department prior to submission of the application in order to ensure compliance and any suggestions had been included in the application
 - It was proposed to use local businesses for the renovation work
 - It was proposed to increase the gap between Glan y Môr and Hafod y Môr by approximately 6"
 - The improvements would be of benefit to the property and nearby property
- (c) The Local Member (a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:
- He had concerns regarding land slippage however following discussions with the planning officers this concern had now been alleviated
 - It was asked if it was possible to impose a condition to clad the property in stone and then to whitewash it to be more in keeping with the other nearby houses
- (d) In response, the Development Control Manager explained that it would be difficult to clad the property with stone however a condition could be imposed to agree with the applicant that a rough render is used that would be similar to stone.
- (dd) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application subject to the inclusion of a condition regarding the finish of the render.

Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:

1. **5 years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Slate to conform**
4. **Agree on render finishes that are similar to stone at the front and to the side section of the extension**

Note: A copy of NRW observations

12. Application number C16/0744/17/LL - Land to the north-east of Y Garreg, Groeslon

Since the Chair had declared an interest in this application and in the absence of the Vice-chair from the meeting, it was proposed and seconded that Councillor Gwen Griffith should take the chair, and the Chair withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion.

Full application to erect 5 two-storey houses, along with the adaptation of the existing access and vehicular road, provision of parking spaces and landscaping.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted the main elements regarding the application. It was explained that this was a full application to erect 5 two-storey houses, along with the adaptation of the existing access and estate road that had been submitted by Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd who provide housing in response to local demand for two bedroom houses.

In terms of size, the houses would measure a total of 79m² per unit and laid out as two sets of semi-detached dwellings with one detached dwelling. Formal gardens would be provided with parking spaces. Additionally, it was seen that part of the estate road and the existing access would be altered mainly by widening. It was noted that separate parking spaces would be provided for the proposed houses on a section of the site for the existing residents of Y Garreg and their visitors.

The application was submitted to committee as the number of houses proposed was greater than that which can be dealt with under the delegated procedure. It was noted that this site was within the development boundary of the village of Groeslon and was on previously developed land. Based on this alone it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in principle. It was recognised that concerns had been highlighted regarding this application and full consideration has been given to all the relevant planning matters submitted.

It was noted that this proposal was submitted on behalf of Cartefi Cymunedol Gwynedd to satisfy local need for housing. Full consideration was given to all the relevant planning matters and the proposal was in compliance with the policy requirements and guidance. It was recommended that the application should be approved with the conditions as noted.

(b) The local member (who was a member of this Planning Committee), noted that he supported the application for the following reasons:

- that houses already existed on the site and it was suitable for housing
- that there was a local demand for this type of housing

however, he expressed concern and asked if the sewerage system was suitable for an increase in use.

(c) In response to the concern, the Development Control Manager noted that Welsh Water did not object the application and they suggested standard conditions and therefore it was accepted that there was sufficient capacity for any increase in use.

(ch) In response to observations made by individual Members, the Development Control Manager and the Senior Solicitor noted as follows:

- no section 106 agreement was imposed on Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd housing and as the houses were small they met with affordable needs housing
- if the houses were placed on the open market sometime in the future, that statutory requirements addressed any concerns if the Housing Association got into difficulties. It was resolved approximately 12 months ago that on balance the risk of releasing the houses without a 106 agreement to Housing Associations was very low.

(e) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:

1. **Time**
2. **Compliance with plans;**
3. **External wall materials to be agreed;**
4. **Slate on the roofs of the dwellings and samples to be presented prior to the commencement of development;**

5. Landscaping details to be submitted for approval;
6. Landscaping plan implementation period;
7. Welsh Water conditions
8. Highways conditions.
9. Biodiversity
10. Withdrawal of PD
11. Working hours to be restricted
12. Land Drainage Unit conditions
13. To submit and agree on boundary treatments

13. Application number C16/0849/32/LL - Crugeran, Sarn

Construction of free-range poultry unit and associated works

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of this application to construct a free-range poultry unit and associated works. The proposal would include erecting a shed with four feed storage areas and the creating an access track to connect the development with the existing farmyard. The shed would measure 135 metres long with a height to the ridge of 6.8 metres. There would be six fans pushing up from the roof, approximately an additional metre. The shed would have a floor area of 2630 square metres for up to 32,000 egg-laying hens. It was proposed for the external walls and roof of the shed to be box profile sheeting of a juniper green colour and the feed stores would measure approximately 3m in diameter and 6.8m high.

It was noted that excavation and infilling work would take place in order to create a flat platform for the structure and a hard-standing would surround the unit. It was proposed to plant trees on the eastern side as a screen. It was intended to use the existing road access and a track will be created from the existing farm buildings towards the poultry unit site. Attention was drawn to the other details regarding how the unit will operate in the first section of the report.

It was noted that the site was in the countryside and within the Landscape Conservation Area and the Registered Historic Landscape of Llŷn and Bardsey. The site is approximately 1km from the AONB. The unit would be located approximately 260 metres from the existing farm buildings of Crugeran and the nearest dwelling houses were approximately 350 metres away at Tre'r Ddôl.

Reference was made to the responses to the consultation in section 4 of the report and no objections had been received during the consultation period although the AONB Unit had expressed concern regarding the visual impact from areas of the AONB. In addition, several correspondences in support of the scheme were received as it would be an economic boost to the local economy.

It was noted that the development plan's policies supported erecting buildings for agricultural purposes if they were reasonably necessary for agricultural purposes. In this case the applicants were a family partnership who run Crugeran farm which was a 190 hectare farm focusing on beef, sheep and cereals. It was proposed to diversify to free-range poultry and it was accepted that there was a valid agricultural purpose for the new development.

The building would be detached and approximately 260 metres from the existing buildings on the holding. This would contribute to the farm's biosecurity by separating the poultry element from the rest of the farm and the location is less visually prominent than closer sites on the existing farm. It was noted that the shed's design was of a general agricultural type but it was significantly longer. Having said this, bearing in mind the design, materials

and proposed colours together with land formation and the intention to plant a screen of trees it was not considered that the building would stand out as an incompatible feature in the landscape.

Attention was drawn to the fact that there were houses in the vicinity of the site and whilst there was potential for the detrimental impact of noise, odours and dust a late response had been received from the Public Protection Unit confirming, having received additional appropriate information that the matters could be controlled via conditions.

Reference was made to other matters within the report such as transportation, biodiversity, archaeology and flooding and it was considered that this was a development that meets the policies of the development plan.

Attention was drawn to the late observations received on the additional observations form submitted to the Committee.

As a result a request was made for the right to act on the application in order that officers could approve following further discussions with the Public Protection Department to ensure appropriate conditions in order to control any possible detrimental effects.

(c) Taking advantage of the opportunity to speak, the applicant noted the following points:

- The enterprise would create an additional 2 full time jobs
- Because the market side of the agricultural industry had been so unstable in the last few years, the enterprise would reduce the risk to the existing family farm business
- The new enterprise would strengthen the business to overcome any future problems
- The new enterprise was exciting for the area
- The family were willing to discuss the conditions together with the relevant officers

(ch) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) supported the application for the following reasons:

- The member welcomed an enterprise that would give opportunities to young people
- Although there had been some doubt regarding odour, it was confirmed that the nearest house is the family farm and as part of the farm there was a 5* self-catering business and therefore they would ensure that there would be no risk of odours nor to the area's residents
- The family were more than willing to enter into discussions regarding conditions regarding the colours of the feed storage, growth etc. to alleviate any concerns raised
- There were no objections from the statutory bodies

(d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application with relevant conditions.

(dd) During the ensuing discussion the following points were highlighted: by individual members:

- Glad to see a family venturing and creating job opportunities for local people in an area where work was scarce
- Supportive of the application and it was in keeping with the environment
- The equipment was modern and would mitigate any odour risks
- It was asked if it was possible to impose a condition to plant semi-mature trees to reduce the impact on the AONB.

Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:

1. **Commence within five years.**
2. **In accordance with the plans.**
3. **The roof and external walls of the poultry unit to be of a dark green colour.**
4. **Agree on the colour of the feed bins.**
5. **Agricultural use of the building only.**
6. **Complete the landscaping plan in accordance with the details submitted.**
7. **Agree on a lighting plan**
8. **Noise levels or any other relevant conditions that respond to matters raised by Public Protection.**
9. **Planting of semi- mature trees as part of the landscaping.**

Notes-

1. **The need for permission to culvert the water course.**

14. Application Number C16/0931/39/LL - Blaen y Wawr, Lôn Engan, Abersoch

Amended application - construct an outdoor swimming pool, swimming pool plant room together with a summer kitchen structure to include a pizza oven and barbecue with mechanical extractor, terraces, landscaping and boundary fence.

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the application's background and noted that a previous application had been refused and the amended application was to construct an outdoor swimming pool, swimming pool plant room together with a summer kitchen structure to include a pizza oven and barbecue and landscaping work at the rear of the garden. It was noted that the site was on a corner plot with nearby dwelling houses and was within the development boundary of Abersoch.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form that stated that an amended plan had been received that indicated highway improvements to the Lôn Engan bend that had not been submitted originally with the application, in an attempt to improve road visibility for all road users and not only for this property. It was noted that the responses to the consultation were shown in the report and specific attention was drawn to the objections received.

It was noted that the garden was fairly extensive and it was considered that the size of the structure proposed was acceptable in terms of the size of the entire curtilage. Likewise, it was confirmed that the size of the swimming pool was acceptable. It was not considered that the proposal would cause any impact on the AONB as the developments would be sunken into the landscape.

The previous application had been refused due to concerns regarding the amenities of nearby houses, however, the amended application was considered an improvement and the concerns had been overcome. Concerns had been received from neighbours regarding the location of the terrace, the swimming pool and the structure that were so close to them, however, as these were located along the boundary it would be difficult to refuse on the grounds of nearby residential amenities and reference was made to the full details in paragraphs 5.6 to 5.8 of the report.

It was considered that the objections had received full consideration and the concerns had been overcome and the application was in compliance with the relevant policies together with an additional condition by the Highways Department to ensure improved visibility.

(b) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:

- Following the receipt of the amended plan and the alterations to improve visibility and safety on the bend that some of the concerns had been overcome and it was trusted that this improvement would be undertaken soon
- It was asked if it was possible to ensure that the boundary fence was strong and in addition that a condition be imposed to restrict the use of music until 11.00p.m. to ensure the amenities of the nearest neighbours

(c) In response, the Development Control Manager explained that it was not possible to impose such conditions regarding the use of music as individuals had the right to use a garden to socialise. It was stressed that the house was not huge and if there was any concern regarding nuisance then it would be possible to deal with the concern at that time.

Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:

- 1. 5 years**
- 2. In accordance with the plans**
- 3. Slate**
- 4. Finish to match the existing house.**
- 5. Landscaping in the next planting season**
- 6. Highways improvement work to be completed prior to the commencement of any further work which is subject to this permission**
- 7. Any relevant Highways conditions based on the amended plan**
- 8. Agree on the type of fence, timetable for erection and maintenance**

The meeting commenced at 1:00pm and concluded at 4:30pm.

CHAIR