
PLANNING COMMITTEE 27/11/17

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

Councillors: Stephen Churchman, Berwyn Parry Jones, Eric M. Jones, Edgar Wyn Owen, Catrin Wager, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams.

Others invited: Councillors Aled Ll. Evans, Judith Humphreys, Siôn Wyn Jones and Dewi Wyn Roberts (Local Members).

Also in attendance: Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Dafydd Gareth Jones (Senior Planning, Minerals and Waste Officer) Cara Owen (Planning Manager), Moira Ann Duell Parri (Environmental Health Officer), Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Officer - Transportation), Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Services / Monitoring Officer) and Lowri H. Evans (Member Support Officer).

Apologies: Councillors Simon Glyn, Louise Hughes, Siân Wyn Hughes, Huw G. Wyn Jones and Dilwyn Lloyd.

1. APOLOGIES

Councillors Simon Glyn, Louise Hughes, Siân Wyn Hughes, Huw G. Wyn Jones and Dilwyn Lloyd.

Due to the number of apologies received the Monitoring Officer highlighted the fact that there was no quorum for items 5.4, 5.5 and 5.9 and therefore it would not be possible to have a discussion on these matters.

In response to the comment, it was suggested that a request should be made to the Assembly to reconsider their quorum regulations and to re-introduce the alternate members system.

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

- (a) Councillor Gruffydd Williams, in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0656/42/LL) declared a personal interest as he had made enquiries to Knights about an allotment.

Councillor Owain Williams, in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0656/42/LL) declared a personal interest as his son had made enquiries to Knights about an allotment.

Councillors Stephen Churchman, Anne Lloyd-Jones and Berwyn Parry Jones declared a personal interest in items 5.4, 5.5 and 5.9 on the agenda (planning application numbers C17/0656/42/LL, C16/0564/35/LL and C17/0844/09/LL) as they were members of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.

Councillor Eirwyn Williams, in relation to item 5.9 on the agenda (planning application number C16/0564/35/LL) declared a personal interest as his daughter lives in Gerddi Arvonja

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

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

- Councillor Dewi Wyn Roberts, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.3 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0628/39/LL);
- Councillor Aled Ll. Evans (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0565/41/LL);
- Councillor Judith Humphreys, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in items 5.6 and 5.7 on the agenda, (planning application numbers C13/0217/22/MW and C17/0455/22/LL);
- Councillor Eric M Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.8 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0826/17/LL);
- Councillor Siôn Wyn Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.10 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0893/18/AM).

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

3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

4. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this Committee, that took place on 6 November 2017, as a true record.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

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

a. **APPLICATION NO. C17/0557/38/LL - LAND BY FFORDD Y TRAETH, LLANBEDROG, PWLLHELI**

Construction of an affordable house.

At the officers' request the determination was deferred as a letter had been received doubting the affordability of the proposed house due to its location. It was highlighted that a better understanding was required of the open market value of the house, what was for sale locally and if there was justification for a rural exemption.

RESOLVED to defer the application.

b. APPLICATION NO. C17/0656/42/LL - MAES Y GARN, STRYD FAWR, NEFYN

Construction of five one-storey houses with one being an affordable house.

The Members had visited the site.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the application's background and explained that the application had been before the Planning Committee on 25 September 2017, when it was resolved to defer for the members to visit the site and to give the applicant an opportunity to respond to the waiting list for allotments received from Nefyn Town Council.

It was explained that the land, that was also in the applicant's ownership, had already received planning permission to construct 10 two-storey dwellings. As part of the permission it was intended to retain the existing application site as 16 allotments with a condition on planning permission C12/1372/42/LL to ensure that this land was used as allotments.

It was highlighted that the applicant (in September 2016) had conducted a survey of the allotments at Y Ddôl (temporary site) to assess how many of the 21 were in use. From the information submitted, only 10 out of the 21 allotments with planning permission were being used. However, Nefyn Town Council noted to the contrary that there were 37 names on a waiting list for an allotment. No copy of this waiting list had been received. Reference was made to the evidence available and how this had been assessed together with the demand for allotments and the policy context.

It was explained that the site was situated within the Nefyn development boundary and therefore the principle of developing the site for housing had to be considered under Policy TAI 2 LDP. It was noted that the policy supported the provision of housing within the development boundary of local service centres. As part of the application it was highlighted that the applicant was willing to sign a Section 106 agreement to tie one of the houses as an affordable unit. This would be equivalent to 20% of the houses and was more than the requirement for Nefyn, and as a result of signing a section 106 agreement for affordable housing tying one of the units for affordable need, it was considered that the proposal would satisfy the requirements of policy TAI 15. In addition, four of the units would have an internal floor area of approximately 56 square metres that was within the maximum size for one-storey, two bedroom affordable houses as recommended in the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Affordable housing namely 80 square metres.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following points:-
- That Maes y Garn allotments needed to be protected because of the importance of the site in Nefyn's history.
 - That y Ddôl was merely a temporary site and there was a wish to return to Maes y Garn once the planning application had been completed.
 - Land at Y Ddôl was unsuitable - poor, wet land and many of the gardeners had lost last season's crops.
 - That improvements to Y Ddôl site had been implemented but this had not improved the land's condition.
 - Following a notice in 'Llanw Llŷn' community newspaper - 16 persons had

shown an interest rather than 3 - this was incorrect information.

- (c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- (ch) During the ensuing discussion the following points were highlighted by an individual Member:
 - The development was within the development boundary.
- (d) In response to a comment regarding future requirements bearing in mind the Well-being Act where the applicant could contribute to improving the standards of the allotments at Y Ddôl, the Senior Planning Service Manager highlighted that the applicant had shown a willingness to improve the site and a commitment to a financial contribution.
- (dd) In response to a question regarding the differences between Maes y Garn and Y Ddôl land in terms of ownership, it was highlighted that Maes y Garn was private land and Y Ddôl was in the ownership of Gwynedd Council where the Council had a duty to provide the land - there would be more protection for Y Ddôl land.
- (e) In response to a comments regarding who will live in the houses, it was highlighted that local people had shown a desire to live in them. In terms of size, it was explained that they were affordable houses in their nature and location - on a site that was convenient for village services.

RESOLVED To delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application subject to signing a 106 agreement to bind nine of the units for affordable housing and to agree on an appropriate method to ensure a financial contribution to improve the facilities of the open space/ play area in the community and also to conditions -

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with the plans.
3. Agree on a Slate roof
4. Agree on external surface
5. Removal of permitted development rights for extensions and curtilage buildings for the affordable house.
6. Welsh Water Condition
7. Parking and turning spaces to be completed in accordance with the plans and to be operational prior to the property's occupation for the first time.

c. APPLICATION NO. C17/0628/39/LL - YNYS FOR BACH, ABERSOCH, PWLLHELI

Demolition of existing dwelling and construct a new house in its place.

Members had visited the site.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that it had been submitted to the Planning Committee on 16 October 2017, where it was resolved to defer consideration for members to visit the site.

It was explained that the proposal involved demolishing an existing single-storey dwelling and replacing it with a new two-storey house together with associated works. The proposed house had a modern design with a zinc pitched roof and walls finished with a combination of white render and timber and stone cladding. It was noted that the site was located within a residential area and within the

Abersoch development boundary, however part of the garden/curtilage was outside the boundary. It was added that site was within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Llŷn Registered Historic Landscape designations. It was noted that local and national policies supported reusing land that had been previously used for developments, rather than using greenfield.

The proposal was considered to be acceptable based on the matters noted in the report, and the proposed development would be unlikely to affect the amenities of nearby residents, road safety and would not have a significant harmful impact on views within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty,

(b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:-

- That he had considered neighbours' concerns
- That the adaptations were an improvement and would tidy up the site
- That a change from a zinc metal roof to a slate roof was better and in keeping with other houses in the area.
- That the property would be used as a home and not a holiday home;
- That he did not now have an objection to the application

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

(ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual Members:

- That the comments of the AONB Unit within the report were unclear - it was hard to interpret if they were in favour or against the proposal
- That the Community/Town Council objected
- That the adaptations were acceptable

RESOLVED to approve the application subject to the following conditions:

1. Commence the work within five years.
2. In accordance with the revised plan.
3. Slate for the roof.
4. Withdrawal of permitted rights on extensions to the house.
5. Submit details of the privacy screen prior to occupancy of the house.
6. Retain / safeguard turning space.
7. Materials (including the stone element as a feature in the design).
8. Welsh Water conditions.

d. APPLICATION NO C17/0565/41/LL - LAND AT BRO SION WYN, CHWILOG

An application to erect an open market two-storey dwelling

It was not possible to discuss this application as there was no sufficient quorum. The application was referred to the next Committee.

6. APPLICATION NO. C16/0564/35/LL - WAEN HELYG VACANT LAND, WAUN HELYG, CRICIETH

An application to erect an open market two-storey dwelling

It was not possible to discuss this application as there was no sufficient quorum. The

application was referred to the next Committee.

7. APPLICATION NO. C13/0217/22/MW - PENYGROES QUARRY, CAE EFA LWYD FAWR, CLYNNOG ROAD, PENYGROES

Environment Act 1995. Application to determine conditions to re-commence the dormant sand and gravel site under planning permission 2250 dated 10 December, 1951 - field number 297, Cae Efa Lwyd, Penygroes

- (a) The Senior Planning, Minerals and Waste Officer stressed that this was an application to Review Mineral Sites under the Environmental Planning Act 1995 to approve a work plan and a list of conditions for a dormant mineral site. It was added that it was not possible for the Planning Committee to refuse the application and they were required to agree to new conditions. It was highlighted that full, modern conditions needed to be applied and the quarry development should be subject to. It was explained that dormant consents could not legally recommence without making an application to the Mineral Planning Authority (MPA) and full modern conditions had been approved. A list of new planning conditions was proposed by the applicant together with a revised list of conditions with amendments by the MPA. It was noted that the MPA had challenged the applicant's conditions and had proposed reasonable conditions that included control of dust, noise restrictions as well as limiting working hours.

Members' attention was drawn to the need for them to also determine a relevant/separate planning application to create a new access for vehicles to serve the sand and gravel pit under reference C17/0455/22/LL. As well as approving the work plan and the conditions, the Committee was also requested to consider the work schedule with a choice of four years and excavating 100,000 tpa and creating a new access, or eight years and excavating 50,000 tpa using the existing access.

It was highlighted that a number of objections had been received as well as a petition objecting on the grounds of the impact on the amenities of nearby residents.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application noted the following main points:-
- NO to re-opening the quarry. NO to the Gravel Pit
 - Major inconsistencies in the report and the assessments
 - Common sense should prevail
 - It was possible to excavate in another three adjacent fields - this raised the suspicions of residents
 - That nearby houses were within 30m to the quarry
 - It was ridiculous to use words such as 'limited impact'
 - Accepted that there were conditions to wash lorries, but what about clothes and the world of nature
 - That the safety of human health was a priority
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:
- That the quarry contributed to the local economy
 - The work would employ 15 full time posts
 - That the gravel was of good quality and was processed locally
 - There were benefits to the alternative application that would restrict excavation to four years rather than eight

- That discussions had taken place with the MPA and there was an agreement on some of these
 - That it was possible to comply effectively
- (ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:-
- NO to the Gravel Pit and NO to the New Access
 - There would be pollution and noise for years
 - It led to concerns - impact on the amenities and well-being of nearby residents
 - That public health standards were different to those that existed back in 1951
 - There were inconsistencies in the assessments and surveys attached to the application
 - That the assessments were historical and general; inconsistent and misleading
 - That Vibrock investigations used common examples and recycled information from one assessment to the next - using the same arguments. Consequently, questions arose regarding the credibility of the assessments
 - In the context of dust, according to World Health Organisation guidance there was no safe distance
 - That the quarry was a danger to the health of local residents
 - Dormant quarries should not be considered for re-opening - it was necessary to follow current policies
 - Pleaded with the Committee to prevent the application
- (d) In response to the comments, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that he accepted that it was a sensitive and difficult application for the Committee with restrictions on their resolution. He reported that it was the responsibility of the developer to present assessments and that the Planning Department had challenged several matters.

The Environmental Health Officer was asked to respond to the concerns. It was noted,

- That officers had been challenging the application since 2014
 - The main aim was to reach a situation where the local community did not face problems
 - That strict conditions had been imposed on the development and that excavation was the best method and not processing
 - In the context of a visible nuisance, it was noted that it was possible to impose a control condition together with controlling the impact on the community's health by setting appropriate levels where it would be possible to monitor the situation if complaints about air quality were presented
 - That officers favoured the four year option as there would be fewer side-effects by not using the access near the houses.
 - Regarding noise, it was noted that a condition to install an additional buffer had been included
- (dd) In response to a comment regarding prohibiting re-excavation, the Senior Planning, Minerals and Waste Officer highlighted that this had been considered, however, the quarry owner had submitted figures for the reserve fund permitted in response to the RAWP Minerals Surveys. In addition, the MPA had received specific enquiries concerning the site for many years.

- (e) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application on the grounds of health and safety and as there was no suitable road to cope with the heavy loads. The improvements needed to be presented prior to any implementation.
- (f) The Monitoring Officer reminded all that the Committee could not refuse the application as planning permission already existed within the Act, and that the Committee's function was to appoint appropriate new conditions for the application. It was noted that the applicant has submitted 30 conditions that would be implemented if the officers had not challenged these and imposed 42 very strict and appropriate conditions.
- (ff) It was not accepted that the proposal to refuse the application was appropriate.
- (g) It was proposed and seconded, with concern, to agree to the revised conditions in order to ensure control of the development.
- (h) An amendment was proposed and seconded to agree to the revised conditions and to propose a new access for the four year excavation option and / or the eight year excavation option.
- (i) A further amendment was proposed and seconded to conduct further discussions, to include local residents, prior to making the final decision.
- (II) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual Members:
 - That it was necessary to have an open discussion with the community to share information.
 - It was necessary for the applicant, the officers, Local Member and local residents to come together to discuss the conditions.
 - That the background and nature of the application made it difficult for the Committee to make a decision
 - It was necessary to challenge technical matters
 - It was necessary to challenge the concerns of local residents about dust

RESOLVED to defer the decision in order to receive further reports on dust matters.

8. APPLICATION NO. C17/0455/22/LL - CAE EFA LWYD, CLYNNOG ROAD, PENYGROES

Create a vehicular access to a sand and gravel pit at Cae Efa Lwyd from the third class county highway at Allt Goch with associated engineering works

It was suggested that the application be deferred as application C13/0217/22/MW and C17/0455/22/LL needed to be dealt with together.

RESOLVED to defer the application

9. APPLICATION NO. C17/0826/17/LL - CRUD Y NANT, BETHESDA BACH, CAERNARFON

Extension to existing storage site for boats/caravans

- (a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the application's background, noting that it was a full application to extend the existing storage site for boats/caravans on a section of an open field to increase the numbers of mobile caravans from 10 to 50.

The recommendation was to refuse the application on the grounds of road safety, as the proposal was a significant increase in the number of proposed units to be stored on the site and consequently the number of vehicles towing a caravan that were likely to use the narrow road between the site and the A499 at Bethesda Bach.

The site was located on a small open hill in the countryside, in an area defined by the Capacity and Sensitivity Assessment as 'undulating agricultural landscape comprising small scale fields together with a pattern of irregular and uneven fields with extensive views of the landscape itself'. Approving this current application would detrimentally affect the pattern and character of this landscape.

Increasing the number of touring caravans from 10 to 50 (in addition to the 40 boats that already had consent at Crud y Nant) would be a significant increase and impact on road safety. In response to the statutory consultation, the Transportation Unit had expressed their objection to this current application on the grounds that the proposal would entail a significant increase in the number of units proposed to be stored on the site. Bearing in mind that the road to the site was sub-standard due to its narrow and winding nature and the lack of passing places/lay-bys, it would create an inconvenience to users who use and serve the site and would undermine the principles of good safety.

It was considered that there were more suitable sites available locally for storage (B8 Class use) with an example of a recent application approved to store touring caravans and vehicles within Penygroes Industrial Estate.

It was considered that the proposal was unacceptable in terms of the requirements of Policy TRA4 of the LDP and was not acceptable based on principle, location, scale, materials, road safety, visual amenities and residential amenities and was contrary to the requirements of relevant local and national planning policies.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:
- The site was secure (with CCTV), convenient and well managed.
 - There were only a few vehicle movements.
 - There had been no accidents since the site was established 12 years ago.
 - The damage to the wall was only an allegation.
 - The business did not affect the neighbours in any way.
 - The site would be evident from higher ground but would be well screened with trees.
 - That Llandwrog Community Council had no objection to the application.
 - Initial discussions had taken place to restrict speed from 40mph to 30mph on the highway.
- (c) The Local Member expressed support to the application with the following main points:
- That the site offered good security.
 - There were a good arrangements for moving and management of the site.
 - There was no truth in the allegations of damage to walls.
 - The applicant had made a substantial investment in the site and operated legally.

- The site was screened well.
 - The demand and need for boat sites had reduced, but the call for caravan storage sites had increased - the applicant was responding to the need.
 - The applicant was a Welsh speaker and lived locally.
 - The neighbours had not objected and were willing to confirm that there would be no impact on their residential amenities.
 - If there was a difference of opinion, it was suggested they could visit the site, or if there was a willingness to re-consider the numbers.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, contrary to the recommendation
- (d) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual Members:
- That caravan sites 'that are intrusive in open countryside' were approved and therefore there was no reason to refuse the principle of this application.
 - That the site would be mitigated well - was not visible from the road
 - There was no evidence of accidents or risks submitted
 - That the applicant gave and sustained a service according to need
- (dd) It was proposed and seconded that the Planning Committee should visit the site.
- (e) In response to the observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the development was fairly substantial in the countryside and was much bigger than what had been conveyed.

RESOLVED: To ask the Planning Service Manager to arrange for the Planning Committee to visit the site.

10. APPLICATION NO. C17/0844/09/LL - LAND AT FORMER MEDICAL CENTRE, PIER ROAD, TYWYN

Full application for the demolition of former medical centre and the erection of 12 dwellings (eight flats and four semi-detached houses) together with access, parking and associated infrastructure

It was not possible to discuss this application as there was no sufficient quorum. The application was referred on to the next Committee.

11. APPLICATION NO. C17/0893/18/AM - LAND OPPOSITE STAD RHOSLAN, BETHEL, CAERNARFON

Erection of seven houses (including two affordable houses), along with new accesses.

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

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the application, noting that this was an outline application to erect five detached houses and two affordable semi-detached with a scheme to create new access from the adjacent Class III county highway. It was explained that matters such as landscaping and design were reserved for consideration at another time. It was highlighted that the application site was situated within the development boundary of the village

of Bethel as contained in the Joint Local Development Plan and the area had also been designated for housing in the Gwynedd Mapping Document (reference T58).

Policy PCYFF1 states that proposals will be approved within development boundaries in accordance with the other policies and proposals in the Plan, national planning policies and other material planning considerations. Policy TAI3 states that in Service Villages housing to meet the Plan's strategy will be delivered through housing allocations along with windfall sites within the development boundary. Policy TAI 8 states that all new residential development should contribute to improving the balance of housing and meet the identified needs of the whole community.

It was added that the site was situated on the western outskirts of the village. It was anticipated that materials similar to those on the nearby dwellings would be used. The site plan submitted with this application was based on the initial discussions between the applicant and the Transportation Unit. The Transportation Unit had no objection to this arrangement subject to the inclusion of appropriate conditions.

In the context of infrastructure, it was highlighted that objections had been received from the public regarding the suitability of the existing public sewer system in the village to cope with more houses, especially when improvements had not been carried out by Welsh Water to increase the system's capacity to take more surface and foul water. The objectors elaborated by stating that the application should be refused until an inspection and improvements had been made to this system.

As part of the statutory consultation process, it was reported that Welsh Water was consulted and a response was received stating that if the Local Planning Authority intended to approve the application that a condition preventing any surface water or/and run-off drainage from connecting directly or indirectly with the public sewer should be included. Whilst recognising the local residents' objections in regards to existing problems with the public sewerage system to cope with more dwellings in Bethel, Welsh Water's formal response to the planning application must be considered, which stated that the proposal on the site was acceptable subject to including appropriate conditions.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application noted the following main points:-
- That there were sewerage problems in Bethel and the system was faulty.
 - That waste and sewerage came up onto the streets
 - There had been a serious mess during the recent storm
 - That the problems affected the amenities of village residents.
 - The problem was historical - had been 'accepted' as a way of life
 - Welsh Water had publicly announced in 2008 that there were problems in the village
 - Work to restore some pipes had been undertaken however the whole system could not cope
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following points:
- The application site was within the development boundary and suitable for a housing development.
 - The development provided a mixture of houses.
 - The Strategic Department stated there was a need for housing in Bethel.

- Bethel had been identified as a service village.
 - The capacity of the local school to admit more children.
 - The homes were suitable to retain young families in the Welsh speaking area
 - Discussions had taken place regarding the access.
 - Welsh Water were satisfied with the application and that only one official complaint had been made (from Bethel) to Welsh Water between January 2014 and the present.
 - A new hedgerow would be planted - the Biodiversity Department had responded favourably.
- (ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:-
- That he was working with village residents to address the need for housing on the best sites within the village.
 - The land of the site in question was unsuitable - sewerage problems that would place more pressure on the existing system.
 - A letter of objection highlighted the deficiencies of the water/sewerage system.
 - The details of Welsh Water work in the village had not been discussed.
 - A fake statement had been published and therefore more information was required prior to determination.
- (d) In response to the observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that he sympathised with local residents, and considering the specific application in question he stated that Welsh Water, as a statutory consultee had noted that there was sufficient capacity for the development. It was accepted that there were other faults to the pipes and it was necessary to check general maintenance work in the village, however, it was the impact of the development on capacity that was in question.
- (dd) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application in order to receive further information from Welsh Water regarding the existing system bearing in mind the flooding on 22/11/17.
- (e) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual Members:
- That the views of Welsh Water were unclear, therefore a review of the current situation was needed and a fuller response to the matter of 'sufficient capacity'.
 - That more recent information was required.
 - It was necessary to consider the system's capacity in the context of recent floods.
- (f) In response to the request for further information from Welsh Water, the Monitoring Officer highlighted that they should only consider the application and Welsh Water had given a sufficient response to the development and it was not necessary to consider the wider problems of the village.
- (ff) In response to an observation, if the application was approved, accepting that there were sewerage problems, it would be possible to impose a condition to improve the system in Bethel and strengthen the community's case to improve the situation, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that it was not possible to do this through the application, but it was possible to hold discussions with the Local Member and the relevant Cabinet Member.

RESOLVED to defer the application**12. APPLICATION NO. C17/0725/38/AM - GLYNLLIFON, LLANBEDROG, PWLLHELI**

Create 13 two-storey holiday accommodation units with associated parking and amenity area

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the application's background and noted that it was an outline application with all matters reserved. It was noted that all the units would be situated close to a steep slope on the eastern boundary of a rural site located outside the village development boundary in a wooded valley within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Llŷn Registered Landscape of Historic Interest and between two Scheduled Ancient Monuments. In LANDMAP it appeared that the site's locality was identified as the visual area of Mynydd Tir y Cwmwd that was noted to have a 'High' visual standard. The site in question was considered to be a very sensitive landscape.

In terms of locating new developments, Policy PCYFF 1 LDP states that land within the development boundaries of towns and villages will be the main focus for new developments with the policy aiming to clearly state the intention of the Local Planning Authority not to support unnecessary developments in the countryside. Policy TWR 2 LDP was also considered, it supports the development of new permanent self-serviced holiday accommodation, or the conversion of existing buildings into such accommodation, or extending existing holiday accommodation establishments, provided they are of a high quality in terms of design and if the criteria are met.

Attention was drawn to the significant concerns of the AONB Unit to the application, although it was an outline application. However, it was deemed that a development of this size and scale would certainly have a visual impact in such a quiet valley.

It was considered that the development would appear to be urban and out of place in a visible, quiet, unpolluted site and totally disconnected from the nearest village. Given the possible economic benefits, these would not outweigh the fact that this development would be totally unsuitable in the countryside within a sensitive site although there was no significant harm to nearby residents or objection from the Transportation Unit.

Having weighed up the proposal against the requirements of relevant local and national policies, it was considered that the proposal was on a site in the countryside and was not acceptable in principle and contrary to location policies that deal with the setting of developments and creating new self-serviced units.

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 main points:
- That the application had overcome four out of six of the criteria
 - That additional information has been submitted
 - That the technical report was acceptable to the Transportation and Biodiversity Units
 - That the proposal was close to the development boundary and was therefore 'acceptable'
 - That the application complied with four out of five of policy TWR2

considerations

- The impact on the wider landscape was 'low' and not 'significant'
- The proposed plan was acceptable

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

(ch) During the ensuing discussion the following points were highlighted by individual Members:

- That the observations of the AONB and CADW had to be considered
- That the application was contrary to the local and national policy requirements

RESOLVED to refuse the application

Reasons:

1. The proposal is contrary to the requirements of the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Holiday Accommodation, Gwynedd Council (2011) and Policies PCYFF 1 and TWR 2 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan regarding the setting of developments and the creation of new self-serviced holiday accommodation, as the proposal is not located within the development boundary and is not considered to be a suitable previously developed site.
2. This development, due to its urban setting, its size and large scale would be a totally unsuitable development in the countryside within a sensitive site and would cause significant damage to the AONB landscape and the area's visual amenities, and is therefore contrary to Policy AMG of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan and Chapter 5 Planning Policy Wales 2016.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 4.30 pm

CHAIRMAN