
PLANNING COMMITTEE 22/07/19

Present: Councillor Elwyn Edwards – Chair
Councillor Eric M. Jones – Vice-chair

Councillors: Councillors Simon Glyn, Louise Hughes, Berwyn Parry Jones, Elin Walker Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, Gareth A. Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams.

Others invited: Councillors Glyn Daniels, Anwen Davies, and Gwyn T Morris Jones (Local Members).

Also in attendance: Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Planning Manager), Siôn Huws (Senior Solicitor) and Lowri Haf Evans (Member Support Officer).

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Stephen Churchman, Anne Lloyd Jones, Huw G. Wyn Jones and Edgar Wyn Owen

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

- (a) The following members declared a personal interest in the following item for the reasons noted -
- Councillor Owain Williams
 - in item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C19/0090/33/LL) as he was the owner of a Caravan Park located less than six miles from the site.
 - Councillor Gruffydd Williams;
 - in item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C19/0090/33/LL) as he was the son of the owner of a Caravan Park located less than six miles from the site.
 - in item 5.3 on the agenda, (planning application number C19/0338/42/LL) as he had expressed his view by calling the application to committee

Members were of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest, and they withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the application.

- (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 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C19/0990/33/LL)
 - Councillor Glyn Daniels, (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C19/0305/03/LL)
 - Councillor Gareth Morris Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.3 on the agenda, (planning application number C19/0338/42/LL)

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 1 July 2019, 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.

6. APPLICATION NO C19/0090/33/LL - TOURING CARAVAN PARK WITH PODS, PLAS YNG NGHEIDIO, BODUAN, PWLLHELI

To site eight additional pods, extend the site, access road, parking spaces and extend amenity building

Attention was drawn to the late observations form that had been received

It was highlighted that the application had been submitted to the Committee as the site was owned by a Council member.

- a) The Planning Manager expanded on the application's background, and noted that the application involved creating a camping site for eight pods which would include an access road and parking spaces. It was noted that it was also intended to construct an extension to the existing self-catering room, to serve the eight new pods.

From the information submitted as part of the application, it was highlighted that the occupancy period of the pods would be between 1 March and 31 October and planning permission would restrict the occupancy of the site to that period within any year. The pods would remain on site throughout the year, and would be unoccupied during the winter months. Bearing in mind that the pods will not be moved for storage to an alternative site during the winter months, the application was considered under Policy TWR 3, which concerns touring caravan and chalet sites and permanent alternative camping accommodation. The site lies within a Special Landscape Area and Policy TWR 3 states that proposals for the development of new permanent alternative camping accommodation will be refused within the Special Landscape Area.

In the context of visual amenities, it was reported that the field, that was subject to the application, was approximately three metres higher than the ground level of the existing caravan site and as part of the proposal the field would be excavated to

reduce the level by approximately one metre. Consequently, the lowest metre of the pods would be sunken into the ground compared to the existing field ground level. Although the sides of the site would be graded when undertaking the excavation work, it was considered that the upper half of the pods would remain visible and the applicant had no intention to undertake landscaping work as part of the application. It was recognised that the dark green colour of the roofs of the pods would reduce their prominence in the landscape; however, this did not overcome the fact that pods would be placed on higher land than the nearby land. In light of this, it was considered that the proposal would not do anything to maintain, improve or restore the recognised character of the Special Landscape Area and the proposal was contrary to the requirements of Policies PCYFF 4 and AMG 2 of the Local Development Plan.

When considering transport and access matters it was noted that access to the site would be along the existing agricultural track and although the proposed site would share the same access to the county highway, there would be a different access to the proposed site and the existing caravan site. Facilities such as toilets / showers and amenities room would be shared between the existing site and the proposed development. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of road safety and complied with the relevant policies.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- Following a suggestion by Gwynedd Council's Biodiversity Unit to place a reed bed in the marsh as a sewerage system, this would not be considered as it would create an undesirable odour and would attract flies.
 - There was a wish to keep Cors Geirch as it was - it had been kept in this way since the 1940s
 - There was sufficient room to site an additional eight pods on the site
 - That it was not possible to move the pods over the winter months as the steel framework would bend
 - There were arrangements for the septic tank to be emptied twice a year
 - It was not possible to plant trees as their roots would make the land unstable
 - Planning permission had been granted for two pods, therefore why make a difference?
- c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation
- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- That the pods suited the landscape better than caravans
 - That farmers had to consider diversification Therefore tourism was an option
 - That it was possible to resolve the situation with the septic tank if correct information was submitted
 - If the pods were mobile and if the applicant was willing to move them, was the application acceptable?
 - That the landscaping element needed to be emphasised
 - If it was possible to consult and compromise with the applicant on the three reasons for refusal, the application was likely to be approved.
- d) In response to a question about how the applicant may be supported to realise the enterprise, the Planning Manager noted that the application was not acceptable due to basic principles. He highlighted that the applicant had not requested pre-application advice and although the Planning Unit had sought

consultation discussions with the applicant, it was evident that there was no intention to amend the application. The Senior Planning Manager added that the recommendation was strong and the principle of Policy TWR3 had recently been supported in an appeal.

- dd) In response to a comment regarding leaving the existing two pods out through the winter, it was asked what was the difference with leaving another eight pods, the Senior Planning Manager stated that there was currently an enforcement investigation into the situation with the two pods. He added that a condition had been imposed on the application to move the pods at the end of the holiday season. He also noted that storage permission existed on the site.

RESOLVED to refuse the application.

1. The proposal would create a new alternative camping accommodation site within a Special Landscape Area and therefore contrary to point 1 of Policy TWR 3 of the Local Development Plan.
2. It is not considered that the proposal would integrate with its surroundings and no consideration was given to landscaping matters as part of the proposal. In light of this, it is not considered that the proposal would add towards maintaining, improving or restoring the recognised character of the Special Landscape Area and that the proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy PCYFF 4 and AMG 2 of the Local Development Plan.
3. No evidence was submitted as part of the application to demonstrate that the existing septic tank has the capacity to serve the eight additional pods. Designated sites are near the site which include a Special Area of Conservation, a Site of Special Scientific Interest and a Ramsar site. As a result of this lack of information, the impact of the proposal on these sites cannot be fully assessed and, therefore, the proposal in its current form is contrary to the requirements of Policy PS 19 of the Local Development Plan and Planning Policy Wales.

7. APPLICATION NO C19/0305/03/LL - 1 BRO DDWYRYD, BLAENAU FFESTINIOG

Two-storey rear extension and side conservatory

It was highlighted that the application had been submitted to the Committee at the wish of the Local Member.

- a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that this was a full application to erect a two-storey flat roof extension with a single-storey conservatory to the gable-end of the house. It was highlighted that the rear extension would measure 7.8 metres in length and 4.8 metres in width, and would extend from the rear wall of the house to the rear boundary wall, where there was currently a single-storey storeroom. Although the proposal was unlikely to constitute a prominent feature in the wider landscape, concern was highlighted regarding the scale and design/form of the rear extension in relation to the character of the existing house. It was noted that Policy PCYFF3 supports proposals that contribute to and enhance the character and appearance of the site, building or area, and that respect the context of the site and its place in the local landscape. It was added that the property was located outside the development boundary and within a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

Although there was no objection to extending the house, it was considered that the design and scale of the proposed rear extension, that would extend 15 metres to the rear compared with the side of the existing house, which measured 7.2 metres, would be incongruous to the appearance and character of the property and would not conform with good design principles. As a result, it did not meet the objectives of policy PCYFF 3 of the Local Development Plan or the requirements of the Design Guidance. It was also reported that the application did not respond to the requirements of PCYFF 2 of the Local Development Plan, although the size of the curtilage allowed the siting of a two-storey extension, the Planning Unit had suggested to the applicant that a more acceptable site was available.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member, who objected to the application, noted the following main points:-

- That the extension was detrimental to the area's characteristics
- It did not suit the site
- An application for an extension on the same site had been refused in September 2018
- There was concern locally that the extension would be used as a holiday unit in the future.

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

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

- That an application had been refused in 2018
- The extension is too large

RESOLVED to refuse the application.

1. The two-storey rear extension, due to its length and scale, would create an oppressive and dominant feature that would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of residents of neighbouring properties. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy PCYFF 2 of the Local Development Plan.
2. The proposal involves constructing a two-storey extension of a scale and design that is not in keeping with the character of the property, and therefore does not add to, or enhance the appearance of the site. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to the requirements of Policy PCYFF 3 of the Local Development Plan.

8. APPLICATION NO C19/0338/42/LL - BWTHYN BRIDYN, LON BRIDYN, MORFA NEFYN, PWLLHELI

Front extension, create a first floor balcony, alterations to the roof and extend an outbuilding to create an annexe

It was highlighted that the application was submitted to the Committee at the request of the Local Member and two other members.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that this was an application to erect a porch on the front of the house; install a first floor balcony along the front of the house above existing flat roof sections; to undertake alterations to the roof by installing a slate roof and a small dormer door to the front; front decking; and extend the existing outbuilding within the property's curtilage to create an annexe at Bwthyn Bridyn, Lôn Bridyn, Morfa Nefyn. It was noted that the property was adjacent to the access to Morfa Nefyn beach, but at a slightly higher level than the beach, with a high boundary wall surrounding the front and sides.

It was reported that the application comprised two elements, namely the extension and the alterations to the house and the extension to the outbuilding to create an annexe. It was reported that the house currently had an asbestos sheeting roof and it was proposed to re-roof with slate, which was an improvement, together with a small dormer door that would not cause substantial harm to the appearance and character of the front.

Several objections had been received to the proposal expressing concern about introducing modern features to the property as the existing fishermen's cottages were unspoiled. Bearing in mind that only a light glazed screen would be in the front of the balcony and that the building's shape would not significantly change, it was considered that the changes would not significantly harm the appearance of the property to justify refusing the alterations. Since the alterations to the house were relatively minor, it was considered that they were acceptable additions in terms of appearance, scale and the treatment of elevations and complied with the requirements of policy PCYFF 3 of the Local Development Plan.

It was noted that the second element involved erecting an extension on the existing outbuilding that formed part of the ownership of the property. As the curtilage was enclosed by a high boundary wall, only a small section of the wall and the roof would be visible from the access road to the beach. It was highlighted that the objections had expressed concern about changing the appearance of a historic building, however, the alterations were not considered to be significantly intrusive and were not unacceptable in terms of scale, height and mass on this site that was enclosed by a high wall. It was considered that the annexe was in compliance with the requirements of PCYFF3.

Reference was made to flooding issues that had been included in the report together with a comment that the plans had changed significantly since the Maritime and Country Parks Officer had submitted his objections.

Having weighed up the application and the amended plans against the requirements of the relevant policies, as well as considering all the observations and the objections received during the consultation period, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable for approval with relevant conditions.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- That his family respected the village
 - That adaptations to the plans had been agreed
 - That using slates on the roof was in keeping with nearby housing
 - The property had been in the family's ownership since 1957 and the family's wish was to safeguard it for the future
 - That it was not proposed to use the house for any commercial enterprise - it was proposed to be for family use only

- That the building had been contaminated by asbestos and if work was not undertaken to save it then the house would become a ruin.
- Asbestos removal was essential and therefore it was an opportunity to update and modernise the house
- It was necessary to ensure that the house was habitable and suitable for future generations

(c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:-

- He considered the adaptations to be substantial
- The Community Council and the local residents were concerned about changing the area's appearance and look
- That parts of the application were acceptable - accept that the house needed some 'care'
- Installing slates in the roof was desirable and would enhance the building's external appearance
- The extension to the outbuilding to create an annexe was also acceptable as this would again enhance the area's appearance
- He was not in favour of creating the front extension and a balcony - he objected on the grounds of an over development within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), lands of interest and a sensitive area
- He noted that the modern design would not be in keeping with the cluster of adjacent housing
- Although the curtilage was enclosed by a high wall, and there was a suggestion that it was not possible to see this from the beach, he doubted the suggestion and noted that it would be visible from the beach.
- The balcony would be visible and would change the appearance of the historic building
- The building was included on postcards that promote the area - need to keep the view as it is.
- That all the cottages were decent without a balcony
- That the plan was incongruous and he therefore encouraged the Committee to refuse

ch) A proposal to undertake a site visit was made and seconded.

a) During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- The changes to the roof were to be welcomed as well as improving the outbuilding
- Installing a balcony would be detrimental to the tranquillity of the beach and would be incompatible with the cluster of housing
- The buildings were historic with special merits
- Need to protect the property from over-development
- The building required care or otherwise it would fall down
- The balcony was a step too far, however, sections of the application were to be applauded

(d) In response to the comments, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that he accepted there was support for specific sections of the application and it may be possible for the officers to hold discussions with the applicant regarding the balcony.

RESOLVED

- **To undertake a site inspection visit.**

- **To hold further discussions with the agent / applicant regarding the first floor balcony.**

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 2.05 pm

CHAIRMAN