PLANNING COMMITTEE 13/06/16

Present: Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones - Chair
Councillor Elwyn Edwards - Vice-chair

Councillors: Elwyn Edwards, Simon Glyn, Gwen Griffith, Eric Merfyn Jones, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen, W. Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams (Substitute).

Others invited: Councillors Ioan Ceredig Thomas, John Wynn Jones, Siân Wyn Hughes, Dilwyn Lloyd and Trevor Edwards (Local members),

Also in attendance: Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor), Gareth Roberts (Development Control Senior Engineer), Moira Ann Duell Parri (Environmental Health Officer - item 5.1 only) and Lowri Haf Evans (Member Support Officer).

1. APOLOGIES: Councillors Endaf Cooke, Hefin Williams and Roy Owen (Local Member).

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

(a) The following members declared a personal interest in relation to the item noted below:

- Councillor Gruffydd Williams (who was a member of this Planning Committee) in item 5.4 on the agenda, planning application no. C16/0310/46/LL - Penclawdd Llangwnnadl, Pwllheli, because he was going out with the applicant's sister; item 5.7 on the agenda - planning application no. C16/0375/42/LL - Nefyn allotments because he was on the waiting list for an allotment; item 5.11 on the agenda - planning application no. C15/1353/42/LL - Fferm Porthdinllaen, Morfa Nefyn because his father owned a Caravan Park in Pistyll, situated less than 6 miles away.
- Councillor Owain Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.7 on the agenda - planning application no. C16/0375/42/LL - Nefyn allotments because his son was on the waiting list for an allotment; item 5.11 on the agenda - planning application no. C15/1353/42/LL - Fferm Porthdinllaen, Morfa Nefyn because he was the owner of a Caravan Park in Pistyll, situated less than 6 miles away.

b) The following officers declared a personal interest in relation to the item noted below:

- Rhun ap Gareth in item 5.1 on the agenda - planning application no. C14/1228/14/LL) - Parciau Bach, Bangor Road, Caernarfon because he knew the objector
- Gareth Roberts in item 5.8 on the agenda - planning application no. C16/0399/17/LL - Cae Ymryson, Carmel because he was the applicant

Members and officers were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and they withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on these applications.

c) The following members stated that they were local members in relation to the items noted:

- Councillor Ioan Ceredig Thomas, (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application no. C14/1228/14/LL))
- Councillor Trevor Edwards, (who was not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application no. C16/0149/15/LL)

- Councillor Eirwyn Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.3 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0292/35/LL)
- Councillor Simon Glyn (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0310/46/LL)
- Councillor Dilwyn Lloyd (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.5 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0337/17/LL) and 5.8 (planning application no. C16/0399/17/LL)
- Councillor Gruffydd Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.7 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/0399/17/LL)
- Councillor Siân Wyn Hughes (who was not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.11 on the agenda (planning application no. C16/1358/42/LL)

The Members who were members of the Planning Committee withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussions on the applications in question and they did not vote on these matters.

4. MINUTES

The Chairman signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this Committee held on 16 May 2016, as a true record subject to correcting paragraph 4 (b) in the English version.

'4(b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) stated that she had no objection to the application and that competition with other businesses within the area in question was not a reason to refuse the application. However, concerns had been highlighted by nearby residents yet it was trusted that the concerns regarding odour would be alleviated by the extraction system. She could not see how it could be refused and stated that the use of the property was to be welcomed rather than to stand empty and deteriorate.'

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

Details of the applications were expanded upon and questions were answered in relation to the plans and aspects of the policies.

RESOLVED

1. Application number C14/1228/14/LL – Parciau Bach, Bangor Road, Caernarfon

Convert part of existing agricultural building into 11 dog kennels together with siting of a sewage storage tank nearby Parciau Bach, Bangor Road, Caernarfon, LL55 1TP

Members of the Committee had visited the site

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that the application had been deferred at the Planning Committee dated 16.05.16 in order to undertake a site visit. It was noted that the report had been amended to highlight

- that Committee members were concerned about the impact of the proposal on the residential amenities of neighbouring residents based on noise and disturbance together with the suitability of the existing access to the site.
- a reference to individual dwellings rather than generalising the dwellings located within the Parciau area which were to the south-east of the site

It was noted that this was a full application to convert part of the existing agricultural building into 11 dog kennels together with siting a sewage storage tank nearby, the creation of an isolation unit to house dogs should they suffer from an infection or illness together with a lounge/office and a food preparation room. The site was located on the western outskirts of Caernarfon in a partially rural area which included dispersed residential dwellings located to the north, west and south-east of the application site.

(b) The Environment Officer acknowledged that dog kennels could have the potential to generate high levels of noise which would affect neighbouring residential amenities and would be a statutory nuisance. The need to consider factors such as proximity to noise sensitive dwellings, insulating the building, the design of the kennels and the size of the exercise area was noted.

It was noted that ideally a noise assessment would highlight acceptable noise, expected noise for the nearest dwelling and measures to weaken noise. It was recommended that a formal noise control plan be produced by the applicant and agreed with the Environmental Health Service. It was suggested that a noise control plan should consider how further noise could be weakened and how to control the dog kennels in order to prevent unacceptable levels of noise e.g., 24 hour presence and specific times for exercise and feeding. It was noted that there was enough information to prove that noise could be controlled to acceptable levels and conditions to reflect this were proposed.

(c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following points:

- That there were problems with water supply to the site. That the problem was difficult to resolve as it was difficult to access the water supply. The problem was likely to increase as the dog kennels were washed
- These were dog kennels and not a parlour - a great change from an agricultural shed use
- No obvious facilities
- The proposal was close to Bed and Breakfast businesses - concern that one business would have an impact on the other and that bad experiences would be shared on sites such as Trip Advisor
- The proposal was likely to create noise pollution in a residential area

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

- Very disappointed with the objectors' observations
- The intention was to collect the dogs and return them in order to minimise traffic to the site
- The entrance had been modernised
- The dog kennels would be of high standard
- Visiting times would be controlled
- The kennels would be insulated to minimise noise
- Trees and plants would be planted to minimise noise impact
- It was not intended to cause any dispute with neighbours
- Enjoyed living in peace and quiet in the area

(d) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following observations:

- He acknowledged that there was a need for diversification and looking for other options and the vision would offer a new provision of a high standard
- Reference was made to the objections from the owners of nearby dwellings that mainly included concerns about noise, the entrance, isolation kennel, water supply and licensing requirements. It was accepted that the isolation kennel and the licensing requirements had been addressed by conditions and that the highways department's observations were acceptable about the entrance

- Needed to recognise water supply problems
- The implications that the business would have on neighbouring businesses needed to be considered
- The location was ideal and it would be disappointing if the proposal would affect the amenities of local residents
- The observations of the Environment Officer were accepted
- If the applicant had submitted sufficient evidence to control noise the Committee would have to consider this

dd) In response to the observation regarding the water supply concerns, it was noted that it would be a matter for the residents to contact Welsh Water to resolve the problem and not via the planning system.

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

f) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were noted by individual members:

- Concern regarding the entrance considering the increased traffic to the site
- The proposal offered a service to the public and therefore anticipated that difficulties would arise with access to the site - needed to control visiting hours
- Concern that the proposal created a business at the expense of another business
- Appropriate action needed to be taken to minimise noise. Should noise affect neighbouring residents then there was a need to consider reducing the numbers, improving the structure or issuing a fixed penalty

- The applicant was closest to the proposal and therefore was likely to ensure that the insulation and noise minimisation work would be of high standard
- impose appropriate conditions to monitor the situation
- if the property were a farm there would be nothing to prevent keeping dogs

ff) In response to the observations, it was noted that there was no doubt that noise was the biggest concern and that it was possible to control this via noise levels restrictions and control via statutory nuisance regulations.

g) In response to observations regarding the entrance, it was highlighted that Welsh Government officers were responsible for the observations because Welsh Government owned the road. It was accepted that the situation was not ideal but that the visibility line was acceptable.

RESOLVED to approve the application

1. **Five years.**
2. **In accordance with the plans.**
3. **Condition regarding implementing the permission in accordance with the information received from the applicant on 13.05.15 together with restricting opening hours for the public to between 15:00 and 18:00 on Sundays only.**
4. **Restricting the number of dogs to 13 only on the site at any time and to 3 dogs only in the exercise area at any one time.**
5. **Condition regarding insulation details to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and to be in place prior to housing any dogs on the site.**
6. **The isolation kennel to be limited for that specific purpose only and not to be used as a normal kennel.**
7. **Restrict noise levels to existing background noise levels.**
8. **Submit a dog control plan to be agreed upon with the Local Planning Authority.**

2. Application number C16/0149/15/LL – Land at rear of 3, Newton Street, Llanberis

Erection of two-storey, three bedroomed dwelling

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that this was a full application to erect a two-storey house on a plot of land to the rear of Newton Street and to the south of Water Street and Well Street within the village of Llanberis and within the development boundary as included in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan (GUDP). It was explained that the house was L-shaped in order to make the most of the site in terms of design and amenities. This would also reduce the effect and impact of the structure in the landscape by breaking up the external elevations of the house. It was reported that the site was served from a private drive which connected to an unclassified county road further on. The road also served a number of private garages as well as the rear of houses on Newton Street.

The site was located on a plateau above nearby dwellings and streets. Following concerns by the Local Planning Authority regarding the impact of the original house's plan on the amenities of nearby residents as well as its impact on visual amenities and the local landscape, revised plans had been submitted which sank the house 1m lower into the land and which also included amendments to some of the windows and re-locating the house a further 1m away from the gable end of number 13 Well Street.

In accordance with policy CH4 the principle of constructing a new house within a development boundary was acceptable; proposals to build new dwellings on unallocated sites within the development boundaries of villages and local centres would be approved provided they conformed to the relevant criteria. In accordance with policy C1 it was believed that the principle of erecting a house on this site was acceptable because the land was within the boundaries of towns and villages which were the main focus for new developments.

Despite the site's prominence in the local landscape, it was believed that there would only be intermittent views of the house itself given the lay-out and design of the house and surrounding streets. Also, its impact on visual amenities would not be more than the impact of similar dwellings within the village which were located on high ground. This, indeed, was the nature and character of the village of Llanberis. It was believed that the proposal, as amended, would not have an unacceptable substantial impact on the residential and general amenities of occupants who lived in the vicinity of the application site.

It was reported that the relevant planning objections had received full consideration in the assessment and there was no matter that outweighed the policy considerations and the relevant advice noted. It was noted that the proposal, as amended, was acceptable and complied with the relevant local and national planning policies and guidelines as noted in the report and that there was no other material planning consideration that contradicted this.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.

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

- That he accepted the officer's report
- That he accepted that the bedroom windows did overlook, but only as every other bedroom window in the street did
- That the ground level had been reduced in accordance with the requirements
- That the development's plans had been amended - the structure was complex and every effort had been made to reduce the impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents

(c) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following observations:

- That the applicant accepted the conditions and had agreed with the planning officers' observations

ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

RESOLVED: Unanimously, to approve the application subject to relevant conditions involving:-

1. 5 years.
2. In accordance with the amended plans.
3. Natural slate.
4. External materials.
5. Removal of permitted development rights.
6. Restrictions on working times.
7. Parking and turning space.

3. Application number C16/0292/35/LL – Land adjacent to George IV Hotel, High Street, Cricieth

Application to change condition 3 of planning permission C13/0028/35/AM in order to extend the time granted to submit reserved matters.

(a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that it was a full application to amend condition 3 of outline planning permission C13/0028/35/AM in order to extend the time granted to submit reserved matters. The development involves erecting 34 sheltered housing units for the elderly, one warden accommodation and two staff accommodation units, and communal facilities. The proposal would also provide 18 parking spaces for use by the residential units' occupiers, and 15 parking spaces for use by the George IV Hotel on the opposite side of the High Street. The site was located within the development boundary and also within the Conservation Area.

It was highlighted that there was no change to the plan, or to the plan previously approved on appeal. It was highlighted that the principle of the proposal had already been accepted and established by the Inspector in his appeal decision, and by means of the further outline planning permission in order to extend the time. With such application, it was noted that there was a need to consider whether circumstances or the planning policy situation had changed since approving the application originally. The proposal could only be considered differently if there was evidence of a substantial change in circumstances in the context of these policies. It was noted that a development of this type corresponded with the Gwynedd Housing Partnership Strategy and the Older People Commissioning Strategy.

It was noted that a current Language Statement had been submitted as part of the application which included specific information regarding the area, the local population and the impact of the development on relevant matters. The report acknowledged the importance of the Welsh language and the consideration that should be given to all relevant issues.

It was noted that all the relevant matters, including the objections, had been considered and that the proposal of extending the time granted for outline application C13/0028/35/AM in order to submit the reserved matters was not contrary to the local and national policies and guidelines noted in the assessment. It was noted that no other material planning matters

stated otherwise and that the proposal continued to be acceptable subject to relevant conditions and as given on the previously approved outline application.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.

(b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following points:

- The application had been submitted originally in 2009 for 38 flats.
- The development was outside the development boundary of Cricieth and that there was no demand for it
- Gwynedd Council had refused originally but the plans had been approved following an appeal
- There had been no development on the site for seven year and therefore this proved that there was no demand for such a development
- A time extension had already been approved in 2013 - no adequate reasons to approve a further time extension
- There was no intention to develop the site only to keep the land and to sell it to the highest bidder
- This was love for money not love towards the language

(c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following points and the valid reasons for the lack of development on the site:–

- Different owners from the original
- The owner had had to deal with problems with Japanese knotweed
- The application submitted was for a time extension - the policies remained the same
- Detailed evidence had been included for the need which had also been acknowledged in the report
- That the owner was keeping to his word of giving a contribution of £134k towards affordable housing in the area - this was a substantial payment
- The owner was keen to move forward

ch) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee), noted that he opposed the application for a time extension. Gwynedd was not for sale.

(d) Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.

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

- No work had been undertaken on the site therefore was the development 'still live'?
- Needed current evidence of the need? Was there other provision in Cricieth for Older People?
- The developer had had adequate time to take action
- Suggestion to submit a new application with appropriate evidence of the need
- Old application = old history
- The observations of Cricieth Town Council for refusing the application must be accepted
- The situation had changed substantially in seven years
- Japanese Knotweed did not take up to three years to eradicate
- Concern relating to the impact on the Welsh language - needed a recent language assessment
- The Housing Strategic Unit's observations were valid and therefore there was a need to consider planning reasons for refusing
- The application was an outline one

- There were no amendments to the plan therefore it would be difficult to oppose the time extension

(e) In response to the observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the circumstances had not changed and that the policies had not changed. It was stressed that the report highlighted the current situation with detailed information explaining that this type of development was needed in Cricieth. It was highlighted that the agent had submitted valid reasons for the delay. Members were urged to look at the evidence before them and that the recommendation noted in the report was robust. On these grounds, it was noted that there were significant risks to the Council should the application be refused, including the risk of costs if it went on to an appeal. Consequently, should the Committee refuse the application; there would be no option but to refer the application to a cooling off period.

f) In accordance with the Procedural Rules, the following vote **to approve the application** was registered:

In favour of the proposal to approve the application, (5) Councillors: Gwen Griffith, Anne T. Lloyd Jones, June E Marshall, Michael Sol Owen and John Wyn Williams

Against the proposal to approve the application, (6) Councillors: Simon Glyn, Eric Merfyn Jones, W Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams

Abstaining, (0)

ff) A Member noted that he proposed refusing based on lack of current evidence of the need for this type of development, together with the need to consider a new language impact.

g) In response, the Solicitor noted that current evidence of the need had been submitted in the report and had been assessed by the Council's Housing Service. It was highlighted that those facts were correct.

ng) The proposal was withdrawn.

h) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application based on the fact that more information needed to be submitted regarding linguistic matters.

i) An amendment was proposed and seconded to defer the decision based on the fact that more information was needed regarding linguistic matters.

RESOLVED to defer the decision based on the fact that more information was needed regarding linguistic matters.

4. C16/0310/46/LL - Penclawdd, Llangwnnadl, Pwllheli

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

a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that this was an application to undertake improvements to an existing touring caravan site together with expanding the site to the fields located to the west and north west of the existing site. The improvements included:

- Increasing the number of touring units from 8 to 22
- Re-siting of playing field and creating a new play area
- Demolishing the existing toilet block and constructing a new building to include toilets and showers

- Creating waste / recycling and drying areas
- Landscaping work.

It was noted that the site was located in the countryside and within the Landscape Conservation Area and the Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. The site was located behind the Penclawdd and Sŵn y Wylan properties located near a class 2 county road (the B4417) between Tudweiliog and Penygroeslon. There was a single track vehicular access to the site.

It was highlighted that although some aspects of the proposal were acceptable as a means of upgrading the site, the Council was not satisfied that the proposal in its entirety, especially the significant increase for a sub-standard entrance, was acceptable. It was noted that as the land on either side of the entrance was not in the applicant's ownership, it was not possible to impose conditions to make improvements to that entrance (it can be seen from the site's history that an effort to do so had failed with the previous application C12/0438/46/LL). Therefore, it was considered that there was no choice but to recommend refusing the application on the grounds of road safety, in light of the increasing use of a sub-standard entrance and which could not be made adequate to meet the requirements of highways and Policy CH33 of the GUDP.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.

b) The local member (who was a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following observations:

- That he agreed with the content of the report
- That the application complied with all planning aspects with the intention of improving standards and creating facilities - the problem was the entrance
- Would it be possible to impose strict conditions to control use of the entrance - propose that there was responsibility of the owner to be present as caravans arrived and departed
- A mirror had been installed on the hedge to improve visibility
- Encourage discussions with highways and planning enforcement
- Accept that the entrance was not ideal, but if accepting eight was acceptable would it be possible to control the situation to seek more.
- A suggestion that it was possible to control the 'in and out' direction to the site
- The enterprise was the livelihood of a young family

c) In response to the observation, the Development Control Manager highlighted that local concerns had noted accidents on the narrow road. It was also noted that it would be impossible to control the 'direction' and 'presence' condition and that the highways concerns were valid.

ch) In response to the observation involving the entrance, the Senior Development Control Engineer noted that an acceptable turning was required for the site. The intention was to treble the number of touring caravans which would lead to more movements which in turn would cause more problems.

d) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

dd) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were noted by individual members:

- That the entrance was sub-standard
- Road safety needed to be considered - we must behave responsibly

- Did allowing eight caravans warrant undertaking significant improvements?
- A suggestion was made to reduce the number to 15 caravans

- A suggestion to hold further discussions with the applicant

e) In response to the above observations, the Solicitor noted that the application submitted had to be considered and that the best answer was for the application to reach an understanding with the land owner. A suggestion was made to advise discussions

f) An amendment to the proposal was proposed and seconded and for a site visit to be arranged.

RESOLVED to arrange a site visit.

5. C16/0337/17/LL - Ysgol Gynradd Bron y Foel

Application for the change of use, extension and external alterations that comprise the installation of solar panels on the former Primary School to create a Community Centre, 16 bed hostel/bunkhouse, cafe, shop, external changing area, meeting rooms/business incubator unit and a treatment room.

a) The Planning Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that this was a full application for a change of use involving undertaking alterations and reuse the former Bron y Foel primary school building for multi-use. It was noted that the building was located in the centre of the rural village of Y Fron. The building was not listed, and the main alterations (apart from the extensions) would be made to the inside the building. The development offered an use for a former school and community building that were partly empty and the use was an opportunity to secure the long-term use of the building. Therefore, it was considered that the proposal complied with the relevant requirements of the policies.

The site contained a substantial and characteristic building, however, it was considered that the proposal and the proposed work, including erecting the extensions and the external finishes, were suitable and unlikely to cause a detrimental impact on the protected landscape as well as the general visual amenities of the village. It was also considered that the proposal conformed to the requirements of the relevant policies.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received and it was highlighted that the Community Council had now supported the proposal.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following points:

- Accept that the enterprise was a good use of a former school, but concerned about the sustainability of the enterprise
- Needed to consider an enterprise that would create jobs for local people e.g. nursery
- Concern that there would be no caretaker or manager for the building / on the site
- Impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents
- Needed to consider the site for local housing for local people

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

- The community of y Fron was leading on the project
- An opportunity here to turn deterioration into regeneration
- The enterprise provided jobs and work experience for local people
- The project included local input - 5 questionnaires and 5 public meetings had been held
- Consideration had been given to the concerns which had been highlighted
- There would be no impact on the Welsh language

- Promoting community life

ch) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following observations:
- That the enterprise would resurrect the community and gave hope to the community after the primary school had been closed
- It was a positive step and advantageous to the community
- Adequate time had been given to respond to what was needed
- Accepted that there were concerns about any change, but those who opposed must be urged to be a part of discussions
- Officers from Gwynedd Council were thanked for their support

d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application in accordance with the recommendation.

dd) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were noted by individual members:
- Accepted that the enterprise was a good idea
- Needed to stimulate discussions in order to respond to the need
- Encourage collaboration
- Welcomed a Community Centre
- Similar enterprises had succeeded in the Deiniolen and Gerlan areas
- Losing a school within the community was sad but welcomed a new enterprise

RESOLVED: Unanimously, to approve the application subject to relevant conditions involving:-

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Materials
4. Low profile solar panels
5. Café's opening hours.
6. Welsh Water conditions
7. Protect the public footpath
8. Need to follow the bat survey recommendations
9. Note by Natural Resources Wales

6. C16/0371/14/LL - Fferm Hendy, Pant Road, Caernarfon

Erection of an agricultural shed for dairy cows together with silage bay

a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the application, noting that this was a full application to erect an agricultural shed on the agricultural holding of Fferm yr Hendy, to the south of Caernarfon. It was proposed to erect a shed which was 61m in length, with a width of 20m and a height of 6.7m to the ridge, on a plot of land adjacent to the holding's existing structures. The proposal would entail re-locating around 60m of the existing *clawdd*, and the creation of a new *clawdd* around the proposed shed. Internally, the shed would contain a new dairy, milking parlour, and storage for milk, tools and cattle treatment facilities. Approving this application would enable the applicant to increase the existing herd (which included 360 dairy cows) and to reduce the time taken to milk the cows from 4 hours to 2 hours per day.

It was noted that the principle of erecting farm buildings had been established in Policy D9 of the GUDP which stated that such proposals would be approved provided they were reasonably necessary for agricultural purposes. The agricultural shed was located in the

countryside but was opposite the numerous existing buildings of the agricultural holding. Any views from it would be intermittent and limited from a distance. The visual impact of the shed would also be mitigated as the current surrounding structures would form a backdrop, and a new *clawdd* would be erected to compensate for the loss of the existing *clawdd*.

Having considered all the relevant matters including local and national policies and guidelines, it was believed that the proposal was acceptable in principle, and based on its scale, location, design, form, materials, and residential and visual amenities.

b) The Chair highlighted that the Local Members had no objection to the plan

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

ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were noted by individual members:

- That the farm was one of the largest in the area
- It employed several people
- The condition of land was good
- It used modern and new equipment

RESOLVED: Unanimously, to approve the application subject to relevant conditions involving:-

1. Five years.
2. In accordance with the plans.
3. Safeguarding public footpath no. 16.
4. Details of landscaping/*clawdd* and operating period.
5. Notify the Local Planning Authority of when the development is completed.
6. Use of the building for agricultural purposes only.
7. External materials and colour to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority.
8. No demolition of the *clawdd* during the nesting season.

7. C16/0375/42/LL - Nefyn Allotments, High Street, Nefyn

Revised application - Construction of four two bedroom bungalows and play area

a) The Planning Control Manager elaborated on the application, noting that this was a full application for a residential development of four single-storey houses and the creation of a play area. It was noted that the site was located within the development boundary of Nefyn and had been earmarked as a protected play area in the GUDP and the site had been previously used as allotments. The neighbouring land to the west, which was also owned by the applicant, had already received planning permission to construct 10 two-storey houses. As part of that permission, there had been an intention to keep the site of the current application as 16 allotments.

It was highlighted that some aspects of the application were acceptable but it was not considered that the information submitted as part of the application proved how the proposal would comply with the requirements of Policy CH42 of the GUDP. Based on the information submitted, officers were not convinced that there was no need for allotments and / or amenity land for similar use in Nefyn. Therefore, it was considered that the information and evidence submitted by the applicant/agent were not adequate, indisputable or thorough to justify the loss of the open space of recreational value in order to build houses and therefore the proposal was contrary to Policy CH42 of the GUDP.

In addition, it was noted that in its current form the proposal did not comply with criterion 1 of Policy CH4 of the GUDP as no proportion of affordable housing was offered as part of

the proposal, and no evidence had been submitted to indicate why it would not be appropriate to provide affordable housing on the site.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received:

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

- The land had been left unused since 2009
- The allotments had been relocated to Y Ddol
- A letter had been sent to enquire about land use, but no response had been received
- Had been to see the allotments at Y Ddol and that eight of the 21 had not been used. The allotments looked unsightly with overgrowth and no-one taking responsibility
- Equipment would not be provided on the green patch
- Willing to consider a 106 agreement
- Local interest in the development

c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

RESOLVED to refuse the application on the following grounds

1. The Local Planning Authority is not convinced from the information and evidence submitted as part of the application that there is no demand in Nefyn for allotments and / or amenity land for similar uses, and therefore it is considered that the proposal does not comply with the requirements of Policy CH42 of the GUDP which requests the protection of open spaces of recreational value.

2. No proportion of affordable housing is offered as part of the proposal, and no evidence was submitted to indicate why it would not be appropriate to provide affordable housing on the site and therefore, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy CH4 of the GUDP and the SPG: Affordable Housing.

8. C16/0399/17/LL - Cae Ymryson, Carmel, Caernarfon

Application for the erection of a garage

a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that this was a full application to erect a proposed double garage within the existing curtilage of a residential property on the outskirts of the village of Carmel. The proposal involved erecting a garage with an internal floor surface area of 28.3m and it would be 4m high. Externally, the walls were to be finished with pebble-dash to match the nearby property and would have a pitched-roof of natural slate.

It was noted that the principle of erecting a double garage within a residential curtilage and for domestic use was acceptable. Due to the location of the garage, which would protrude further than the front wall of the residential property on the site, formal planning consent was required. It was not considered that there were implications in terms of visual amenities for the surrounding area.

All the material planning matters had been considered, and it was believed that this proposal to erect a double garage within the residential curtilage for domestic use was acceptable and consequently complied with the requirements of the relevant policies noted in the report.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received:

b) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee), noted that he supported the application.

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

RESOLVED: Unanimously, to approve the application subject to relevant conditions involving:-

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Materials
4. No business use
5. Welsh Water Note

9. C15/0808/20/LL – Menai Marina, Hen Gei Llechi, Y Felinheli

Retrospective application to retain a pontoon within the quay.

a) The Development Control Manager noted that the Planning Committee, at its meeting on 9 November 2015 had requested for officers to consult with the Building Control Unit on the content of the latest structural report and the minutes from that Committee noted this. By now, it was given to understand that a building control application could be submitted to the Building Control Unit in future and therefore it would be inappropriate for the Building Control Unit to give its opinion on this report. Therefore, a request was made to obtain the right to defer the decision and ask for the right to consult with a structural engineer within the Council (rather than the Building Control Unit) in order to obtain an opinion as to whether the latest structural report was adequate and acceptable.

b) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application.

RESOLVED to defer the application in order to seek the opinion of a structural engineer in order to confirm whether the latest report received on 15.4.16 is adequate and acceptable.

10. C15/0807/20/CR – Menai Marina, Hen Gei Llechi, Y Felinheli

Retrospective application to retain a pontoon within the quay.

a) The Development Control Manager noted that the Planning Committee, at its meeting on 9 November 2015 had requested for officers to consult with the Building Control Unit on the content of the latest structural report and the minutes from that Committee noted this. By now, it was given to understand that a building control application could be submitted to the Building Control Unit in future and therefore it would be inappropriate for the Building Control Unit to give its opinion on this report. Therefore, a request was made to obtain the right to defer the decision and ask for the right to consult with a structural engineer within the Council (rather than the Building Control Unit) in order to obtain an opinion as to whether the latest structural report was adequate and acceptable.

b) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application.

RESOLVED to defer the application in order to seek the opinion of a structural engineer in order to confirm whether the latest report received on 15.4.16 is adequate and acceptable..

11. C15/1358/42/LL – Fferm Porthdinllaen, Morfa Nefyn

Improvements to touring caravan site which include increasing numbers from 36 to 60 units, formation of 61 hard-standings, re-siting of playing field and creation of a new play area, service connections, demolition of amenity block and erect new amenity building to include shop, formation of internal roadway and parking area, siting a manager's caravan and undertaking landscaping works.

a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that a decision had been deferred by the Planning Committee held on 25 April 2016 in order for officers to hold discussions with the applicant in terms of improving the design of the proposed amenities block. On 17 May 2016, an amended plan had been received, lowering the height of the building and changing the roof pattern to a pitched-roof rather than a hip roof. It was noted that it was the amended plan which was before the Committee.

Members were reminded that this was an application to undertake improvements to an existing touring caravan site in Fferm Porthdinllaen, Morfa Nefyn. The improvements included:

- Increasing the number of touring units from 36 to 60
- Locating 1 touring caravan for the manager
- Creating 61 hard-standings
- Re-siting of playing field and creating a new play area
- Installing connections to services and private treatment tank
- Demolishing the existing toilet block and constructing a new building to include toilets, showers, shop and reception, office, launderette and open kitchen.
- Creating an independent track to the caravans field, and internal road and overflow parking site
- Landscaping work.

It was noted that although the proposal was substantial, the development was an improvement.

b) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following observations

- That she accepted the recommendation
- Pleased that a compromise had been reached and that the design had been agreed upon
- The applicant had lowered the height of the roof
- Building was attractive, and striking with traditional elements
- An enormous investment in the area

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

RESOLVED: Unanimously, to delegate powers to the Senior Planning and Environment Manager to approve the application with the following planning conditions, subject to receiving favourable observations from Natural Resources Wales regarding drainage methods.

1. 5 years
2. In accordance with the amended plans
3. Restrict numbers to 60 touring units and 1 touring unit for a manager
4. Site all caravans on their pitches as shown on the approved plans only.

5. **The season to locate caravans on the site between 1 March and 31 October only.**
6. **Holiday only**
7. **Keep a register**
8. **Agree on finishes of the hard-standings**
9. **Agree on slate and external finish of the building**
10. **Landscaping in the next planting season and replant if they are damaged or if they die.**
11. **Any relevant condition by NRW**
12. **No storing of caravans within the caravans field**

Note: Measures to promote the Welsh language
Note: Upgrade caravans licence

The meeting commenced at 1:00pm and concluded at 4:15pm.

CHAIR