

---

**PLANNING COMMITTEE 22 May 2023**

---

**Present:**

**Councillors:** Elwyn Edwards, Elin Hywel, Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Elwyn Jones, Gareth T Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Cai Larsen, Edgar Owen, Gareth Coj Parry, Gareth A Roberts, John Pughe Roberts, Huw Rowlands and Gruffydd Williams

**Officers:** Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Planning and the Environment), Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Services), Gwawr Teleri Hughes (Development Control Team Leader), Glyn Llewelyn Gruffudd (Senior Development Control Officer), Miriam Elen Roberts (Solicitor), Erin Lloyd (Cynllun Yfory - Legal) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

Condolences were extended to Keira Sweeney (Planning Manager), following the sudden loss of her mother recently.

Cllr John Pughe was wished a speedy recovery following a period in hospital.

**1. ELECTION OF CHAIR FOR 2023/24**

**RESOLVED TO RE-ELECT COUNCILLOR EDGAR OWEN AS CHAIR FOR 2023/2024**

**2. ELECTION OF VICE-CHAIR FOR 2023 / 2024**

Two names were proposed and seconded for the post of vice-chair, namely Councillor Elwyn Edwards and Councillor Gruffydd Williams

**In accordance with Procedural Rules, the following vote was recorded on the proposals:-**

**In favour of Councillor Elwyn Edwards: (10) Councillors:- Elwyn Edwards, Elin Hywel, Huw Wyn Jones, Edgar Owen, Huw Rowlands, Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Gareth Tudor Jones, Cai Larsen, Gareth A Roberts, Gareth Coj Parry**

**In favour of Councillor Gruffydd Williams: (4) Councillors:- Anne Lloyd-Jones, Gruffydd Williams, Elwyn Jones, John Pughe Roberts**

**Abstaining (0)**

**RESOLVED to re-elect Councillor Elwyn Edwards as Vice-chair for 2023/24**

**3. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor John Pughe (Local Member)

**4. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS**

a) The following member declared that he had an interest in relation to the item noted:

Councillor Huw Wyn Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 8.4 (C23/0148/17/LL) on the agenda as he knew the family.

The Member was of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest, and he withdrew from the meeting during the discussion on the application.

Councillor John Pughe Roberts (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 8.1 (C23/0116/09/LL), because he had shares in the Wynnstay company.

The Monitoring Officer noted that there was no reference to the Wynnstay company in the report for planning application 8.1 and therefore the Councillor decided that it was not a prejudicial interest and therefore he did not have to withdraw from the meeting.

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

- Councillor Dewi Jones in item 7 on the agenda
- Councillor Anwen Davies (on behalf of Cllr Gareth Williams) and who was not a member of this Planning Committee, in item 8.2 (C23/0212/30/LL) on the agenda.
- Councillor Arwyn Herald Roberts (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 8.4 (C23/0148/17/LL) on the agenda.

## 5. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

## 6. MINUTES

The Chair accepted the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee held on 17 April 2023 as a true record.

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

### **CYNGOR GWYNEDD ORDER (PROHIBITION, RESTRICTION AND REVOCATION OF WAITING AND ON-STREET PARKING) (ARFON AREA NUMBER 20) (CAERNARFON) 2023**

a) The Traffic and Projects Service Manager highlighted that the Service had received a complaint from nearby property owners regarding vehicles parking on the pavement and on a grassed area adjacent to the property of Tanffordd, Llanberis Road, Caernarfon. After inspecting and assessing the situation, the Service carried out a consultation on introducing a recommendation to extend the double-yellow lines in order to prevent vehicles from parking on the pavement and grassed area. During the consultation period (March 2022), one objection was received to the proposed plan. Consequently, the plan was reviewed in August 2022 and it was resolved not to amend the proposal since there was acceptable justification to proceed with the plan. The proposed plan to prohibit parking on Llanberis Road was introduced as a part of the 'PROHIBITION, RESTRICTION AND REVOCATION OF WAITING AND ON-STREET PARKING) (ARFON AREA NUMBER 20) (CAERNARFON) ORDER 2023' and an objection was received for the second time. The order was submitted to the Committee for approval.

The Officer was of the opinion that introducing yellow lines in the location would prevent vehicles from driving over the pavement to park on the grass near the Tanffordd property. In turn, this would reduce the number of cases where mud would be carried onto the pavement and the road, which led to safety issues for road users. Yellow lines

would also keep the visibility splay clear for the residents of Stad Llain y Felin, as well as the Tanffordd property.

b) The Local Member highlighted the following observations:

- That he sympathised with the objector since this would cause him difficulties, but he was confident that the benefits would outweigh the negative impacts.
- It was important to note that the department had carried out an equality impact assessment and this had come back clear.
- A health and safety matter was under consideration here. The yellow lines intended to prevent vans and other vehicles from parking on a plot of land, as was currently the case. This was a problem because:
  - It is a relatively fast road - the vehicles prevent the traffic from seeing the road ahead.
  - The vehicles that park here carry mud onto the road, which is dangerous and creates a skid hazard.
  - Parking here destroys the grassed area; it is mud, and not grass, that is here now.
- It is also important to note that many local residents have supported these steps during the consultation process.

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

d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observation was made by Members:

- That there was a need to ensure safety on a fast section of road
- That there was mud on the pavement and therefore you had to walk on the road
- That the height of a camper van, when parked on the grass, concealed a 40mph sign

e) In response to a question that vehicles would continue to park on the grass and the pavement since the yellow lines would only appear on the road, it was noted that the yellow lines would prohibit parking on the road, on the pavement and on the grass.

## **RESOLVED**

**To approve the introduction of no waiting at any time 'Double Yellow Lines' on a Class 1 Road A4086 - Llanberis Road, Rhosbodrual, Caernarfon.**

## **8. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered the following applications for development. Details of the applications were expanded upon and questions were answered in relation to the plans and policy aspects.

## **RESOLVED**

### **8.1 APPLICATION NUMBER C23/0116/09/LL 1 Idris Villas, Tywyn, Gwynedd, LL36 9AW**

**Resubmission: Change the use of land to create a storage/sales yard associated with the existing commercial premises, together with the erection of a security**

**fence, installation of a hard-standing area and alterations to the agricultural access to create a vehicular access to the yard**

**Some Members had visited the site on 15-05-23**

- a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application to change the use of land in order to create a storage / sales yard adjacent to Idris Villas, Tywyn, which would be associated with the existing commercial property located on the High Street. The proposal would include erecting a security fence, installing a hard standing area and alterations to the existing agricultural access to create a suitable vehicular access. It was reiterated that a Planning Statement, Flood Consequence Assessment and Initial Ecological Report had been submitted as a part of the application and subsequently on 29 March 2023, a Landscaping Plan had been introduced around the boundary fence. Following the previous Committee, details were submitted on 28 April 2023 regarding the exit routes for HGVs from the site.

Reference was made to the visual impact amongst the refusal reasons on the previous application C22/1050/09/LL, with officers highlighting that the same concerns remained valid. Despite receiving a landscaping plan which showed an intention to landscape the external side of the security fence, it was considered that this would mitigate the visual impact of the development somewhat, however, it did not completely overcome the concerns.

In the context of transport and access matters and the observations of the Highways Unit (since the previous Committee on 17 April 2023), plans of the HGV exit routes from the site were received, as well as details on how the vehicles would turn within the site. It was noted that the site was central in the town and that the access on the external side would be in the bow of the road. Following a site inspection, it was considered that there was satisfactory open visibility in both directions. There would be parking within the site for customers and is considered acceptable to satisfy the requirements of TRA 2 of the LDP. The observations of the Transportation Unit on the latest additional information, which state their satisfaction with the plans that show the movements of vehicles leaving the site and they have no objection. Based on the latest observations, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in order to ensure the safe operation of the highway and compliance with policies TRA 4, criterion 6 of policy MAN 6 of the LDP and TAN 18: Transport.

It was noted that the officers considered that the development continued to be unacceptable based on flood concerns, the impact on the area's visual amenities, as well as the amenities of the nearby residents. Although some elements were acceptable, they did not outweigh the fact that the principle of the proposal failed to meet the national policy justification tests of Technical Advice Note 15. These concerns were raised in response to a Pre-application Enquiry where a recommendation against submitting an application was made, on the grounds that locating the proposal in a C1 flood zone could not be justified. A landscaping plan has now been submitted which will involve a slight improvement in terms of visual amenities, however it does not overcome all of our concerns. The additional information relating to vehicle access and egress paths has overcome our original concerns regarding road safety and therefore reason 4 can be deleted from the reasons for refusal. However, it was considered that the proposal essentially remained similar to the details of the application that was refused earlier this year under application C22/1050/09/LL which is a material consideration.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, contrary to the recommendation, on the grounds of economic impact - it would retain a business in the area.

- c) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- That the existing site was dangerous - heavy traffic in the town centre
  - That the Local Member, at the previous meeting, had proposed good reasons for approval
  - The Town Council supported the application
  - The plans were an improvement in terms of visibility - possible to plant and erect a fence which would offer a better view
  - No flooding history in this area
  - No objection had been received to the application from the residents of the town
  - That the road leading to the existing site was busy - this offered an improvement to the situation
  - That this would not have a detrimental impact on the residents of Idris Villas
  - That the site visit had been very valuable

In response to a question regarding the reference to a goods 'storage' yard, and should there be a need in the future for a structure to store goods and the need for further planning consent for this purpose, it was noted that no information had been submitted with the application regarding the layout of the storage area and therefore, should the application be approved, there would be a need to impose a condition to ensure management of the storage arrangement and height. With the reference that the enterprise is 'ancillary to existing / commercial property', it would be essential to include a condition to address this.

- ch) An amendment was proposed to approve the application subject to imposing conditions, including:
- Permission associated with the commercial property only
  - That the application corresponds to what is being noted by the Transportation Unit - access to follow the submitted plans - safe and wide
  - That sufficient planting and fencing is done along the boundary to reduce the visual impact - ensure that the planting is green and tall
  - That the site is lower than the houses and therefore there is a need to consider that the height of the goods being stored is capped.

In response to the improvement, the Assistant Head noted that including the 4 above conditions was acceptable and he reminded them of the need to impose conditions in order to act on issues arising from the flooding assessment. A further member was made by a Member that a condition needed to be included on managing the goods delivery / distribution times.

#### **RESOLVED to approve the application contrary to the recommendation**

- 1. The development to which this permission relates shall be commenced no later than FIVE years from the date of this permission.**
- 2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict conformity with the details shown on the plan(s) numbered 80 1 - 22 - 0 5; 801 - 22 - 70; 22/115/P 09; 22/115/P 04 a 22/115/P 03 Amendment A submitted to the Local Planning Authority, and contained in the application form and in any other documents accompanying the application, unless condition(s) to revise them is/are included on this planning decision.**
- 3. Before the facility hereby approved becomes operational as a storage/sales yard, the applicant must first submit details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority of any building and/or structure they propose to erect as part of the proposed facility, including their design and height.**

4. The facility hereby approved must be connected with the use the applicant proposed to make of the commercial premises on the High Street as a business centre for an agricultural goods/materials supplier and which is outlined in blue in plan number 22/115/P 03 Amendment A.
5. The scheme for planting a mixed thorn hedge contained in plan number 22/115/P 03 Amendment A must be completed during the first planting season after the use becomes operational. In the event that any part of the hedge dies, is removed or becomes seriously damaged or infected within the five year period from the date it was planted, they must be removed and replaced during the next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority approves a commitment in writing.
6. Before the facility becomes operational, the applicant must first submit details to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority of any signs to be erected on the site, and those signs shall be in Welsh only, or bilingual with priority to the Welsh language.
7. The applicant must comply with Part 6.0 (Summary and Conclusions) of the Floods Consequence Assessment (ref. KRS.0639.001.R001.A) dated September 2022 by KRS Environmental.
8. The improvements to the existing access must be carried out in strict conformity with the details contained in plan number 22/115/P 03 Amendment A.
9. The delivery or distribution of goods to and from the site hereby approved shall not be permitted outside the hours of 08:00 to 18:00 Monday to Friday; 08:00 to 12:00 Saturday and not at all on Sunday.

The reasons for the Council's decision to permit the development subject to the conditions already noted:

1. To comply with Town and Country Planning Acts.
2. To comply with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act and to secure the satisfactory development of the site, and to protect the visual amenities of the area.
3. To secure and orderly development of the site and to protect visual amenities.
4. To secure the orderly development of the site.
5. To protect visual amenities and to ensure biodiversity enhancements.
6. To protect and promote the Welsh language.
7. To comply with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 15: Development and Flood Risk.
8. In the interests of road safety.
9. To protect residential amenities.

#### Notes

1. Due to the size and nature of the development, an application will need to be provided to the Sustainable Drainage Systems Approval Body for approval before construction work commences. These systems need to be approved by Cyngor Gwynedd in its role as the Sustainable Drainage System Approving Body before the work starts.
2. The applicant's attention is drawn to the letter from Welsh Water dated 24/02/23 and the need to ensure that the development complies with the advice contained therein. The letter can be viewed under this application's reference number on the track and trace pages on the Council's website.

3. **NOTE: The road verge in front of the access must be reinforced with 125 x 150mm dropped kerbs installed in accordance with 'Road Design'.**
4. **NOTE: The Highways Agency shall not be responsible for any surface water from the road that enters the premises as a result of the development.**
5. **NOTE: The applicant is instructed to write to the Highways Authority to be granted permission under Section 278 of the Highways Act, 1980 to undertake any work which entails changes to the existing road in order to create an access to the site.**
6. **NOTE: Surface water from the site curtilage should not flow to the main road. The highway drainage by the access and along the frontage must be completed to meet the requirements of the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced on the rest of the development.**

**8.2 APPLICATION NUMBER C23/0212/30/LL  
Pant Valley, Rhydlios, Pwllheli, Gwynedd, LL53 8LR**

**Construction of a new building to be used as agricultural storage together with associated landscaping work (resubmission)**

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was an application to erect a shed as agricultural storage on a rural site within the holding of the property known as *Pant Valley*, Rhydlios. It was explained that the plans showed a building measuring 22.86m x 13.74m giving a total internal floor area of 314m<sup>2</sup> and 5.8m in height to the ridge. The application was a resubmission of a previously refused full application. It was highlighted that the size, form and appearance of the proposed shed was in accordance with the previously refused details. The site and wider area was located within the Western Llŷn Special Landscape Area as well as the Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest by CADW. It was not within the AONB.

The previous application was refused due to the lack of information and justification for the proposed development. At the time it was noted that no business plan had been submitted. It was not usual to ask for a business plan with agricultural applications where the agricultural holding was established, however in this case, the applicant did not operate the agricultural holding and therefore, it was believed to be a totally reasonable request for such information to find out how the enterprise would be likely to operate in the future. As part of the current application, the agent has submitted a statement to support and justify the proposal.

The application was submitted to the committee at the Local Member's request.

The Local Planning Authority did not intend to prevent the aspirations of individuals to conduct agricultural activities in the future, but it was not wholly convinced that a real need for a new agricultural shed at this site has been proven and therefore the proposal is contrary to the fundamental agricultural development principle and policies PCYFF 1 and PCYFF 2 of the LDP specifically as there is no sufficient justification within a rural location for the proposed development. In addition, due to its size, finish and isolated location, the building would form an incompatible feature in the landscape by harming visual amenities contrary to the relevant criteria of policies PCYFF2 and PCYFF 3 of the LDP.

The Local Planning Authority recommended refusing the application

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, Councillor Anwen Davies (on behalf of the Local Member), made the following observations:
- That there was a real need for the shed to ensure a place to keep sheep - for grazing and in order to facilitate visits by the vet.
  - That a proposal to reduce the land levels had been submitted and that it was intended to use the soil to erect *cloddiau* around the shed.
  - That there was an intention to plant trees and recycle rainwater.
  - That the applicant was a hard-working Welshman who wished to establish an agricultural enterprise at Pant Valley.
  - The Community Council supported the application.
  - That the shed would be no more visible than other sheds in the area.
  - That the existing shed was too close to the house.
  - Proposed that the Committee Members visited the site.

In response to the comments, the Assistant Head noted that it was not unusual to receive agricultural applications, but that there was a need to provide evidence of the agricultural need (such as consider the stock levels and receive details about the business). In this case, it was an application for a large shed for 10 acres of land; this was considered to be a substantial investment where no current agricultural business existed. The proposal was therefore completely contrary to local and national policies.

- c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members
- That no alterations had been made to the previously refused application.
  - That a request for further details, such as a business plan, was reasonable.
  - That the Community Council supported the application and knew the applicant well to understand his call for building a shed - local people must be kept in local areas.

**RESOLVED: TO REFUSE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE RECOMMENDATION.**

**REASONS:**

1. **Based on the information submitted, the Local Planning Authority is not entirely convinced that there is a real need, proven beyond doubt, to erect an agricultural building of the size and scale proposed at this location. Therefore, the application is contrary to the requirements of policies PCYFF 1 and PCYFF 2 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan 2017 which encourages the refusal of proposals outside development boundaries unless there is justification to show that its location in the countryside is essential, and that do not comply with other policies within the Plan itself.**
2. **The scale of the proposal would mean erecting a substantial building which would be located in a prominent, isolated position near a public road and footpath and within a Special Landscape Area. This development would not respect the context of the site and its place in the local landscape and, as a result, the development would be harmful to the area's visual amenities. The application is therefore contrary to the criteria of policies PCYFF 2, PCYFF 3 and AMG 2 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan, 2017 together with the advice contained within Technical Advice Note 6:**



**Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities and Technical Advice Note 12:  
Design that relates to protecting local visual amenities and the environment.**

**8.3 APPLICATION NUMBER 8.3 C23/0089/39/AM  
Mynytho Garage, Mynytho, Pwllheli, Gwynedd, LL53 7RH**

**Outline application with some matters reserved to demolish an existing residential dwelling and former commercial garage with associated buildings and to construct five two-storey local market housing, construction of a pub/restaurant, landscaping, creation of parking areas and alteration works to an existing vehicular access.**

**APPLICATION WITHDRAWN**

**8.4 ITEM 8.4 C23/0148/17/LL  
Uwchlaw'r Rhos, Penygroes, Caernarfon, Gwynedd, LL54 7UE**

**Construction of a rural enterprise house and associated work.**

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application to construct a rural enterprise house and ancillary works. The house would be in the form of a dormer bungalow and would measure 115 square metres and would include a porch, office, toilet, multi-purpose room, sitting room, dining room and kitchen on the ground floor and three bedrooms and a bathroom on the first floor.

The farm was described as one that extends to 84ha; the applicant owns 59ha and rents 24.3ha on a long-term tenancy, with 84ha being used as grazing land, 20ha for silage (one cut) and 8ha for silage (two cuts) and used as grazing land. The farm includes 118 cows with calves, 120 sheep, and 4 sows and 12 boars and 27 piglets. The applicant is also in partnership with Natural Resources Wales for grazing 1,618ha of common land.

A Design Statement and the business' accounts were submitted as a part of the application.

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee at the request of the local member.

It was highlighted that the site would be beyond the farmyard and outside any development boundary as defined by the Local Development Plan (LDP) with Policy PCYFF 1 stating, outside development boundaries, that proposals will be refused unless they are in accordance with other policies in the local development plan, national policies or if the proposal shows that their location in the countryside is essential. It was reiterated, as a result of the need to maintain and protect the countryside, that very special justification was required to approve the construction of new houses there, and therefore, new houses in the countryside were only approved in very exceptional circumstances. The exceptional circumstances under which new houses in the countryside could be approved are included in Technical Advice Note 6: Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities - July 2010 (TAN6) prepared by the Welsh Assembly Government, and the associated Technical Guidance document.

Reference was made to paragraph 4.3.1 of TAN6, which notes that one of the few circumstances in which a new isolated residential development in the open countryside can be justified is when accommodation is required to enable a rural enterprise worker to live at, or close to, his workplace. Whether this is essential in any particular case will depend on the needs of the rural enterprise concerned and not on

the personal preference or circumstances of any of the individuals involved. TAN 6 also notes that Local Planning Authorities should carefully assess applications for planning permission for new rural enterprise dwellings to ensure that a departure from the usual policy of restricting development in the open countryside can be fully justified by reference to robust supporting evidence.

The applicant states that the business has existed for over 3 years. Business accounts for the previous three years were submitted to show that the business has made a profit in 3 of the last 4 years. Nevertheless, it appeared that there is an established business on the land, and therefore in line with the requirements of TAN 6, information must be submitted that relates to the functional test, time test, financial test and other dwellings test to prove the need and justification for the construction of a house in open countryside.

In the context of the financial test, the size and cost of the proposed dwelling should be assessed in relation to the enterprise's ability to fund and maintain it without damaging the ongoing viability of the enterprise, and demonstrate reasonable likelihood that it will maintain to fund the labour costs employed for the subsequent five years. In addition, the figures provided for the Financial Test should show that the business can cope with paying workers' wages (1.5 in this case) and that there are earnings left to maintain the business and construct the house. Although an accountant has provided a statement referring to the business' profit over the past 3 years, it was not considered that the applicant has provided robust evidence to show that the financial situation of the business is sufficient in order to construct a house and therefore the application cannot be supported as it fails the financial test.

In the context of design matters, it was noted that the size of the proposed dwelling was being considered in relation to the enterprise's ability to fund and maintain the dwelling, as well as reflect the needs of the enterprise, but in addition, as the potential occupancy of the dwelling was extended to those who were eligible for affordable housing, the size of the dwelling should comply with Affordable Housing requirements. It was highlighted that the internal floor area of the proposal was approximately 115sq/m, which was more than the Affordable Housing requirement of 93sq/m. Therefore, it was considered that the size of the property did not comply with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 6, the LDP or Supplementary Planning Guidance: Affordable Housing.

Having conducted a full assessment, the LPA was of the opinion that the proposal submitted did not comply with the specific criteria for constructing a house in open countryside within the criteria proposed within Technical Advice Note number 6: Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities for constructing agricultural dwellings. It was considered that the proposal did not comply with the principle or spirit of the policies and that proposal would be an obtrusive feature in the landscape located in open countryside.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following observations:
- That four generations of the family had been tenants on the land within the Glynllifon Estate. In 2018, there came an opportunity to buy the land but the two dwellings were being sold separately.
  - That the farm buildings and the two houses were Grade 2 Listed.
  - That the son had bought one of the houses with a personal mortgage.
  - The second house had been sold separately.
  - That he had two sons and both worked (not on the farm).
  - The proposal would not be a second house - the son's house was not a house with the business. This was outside the farm's ownership.

- That he was living in Penygroes and was travelling every day back and forth to the farm - that this was very difficult between March and April during the lambing season.
  - That it could be argued that he was the only worker who was present on the farm.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:
- This was an application to erect a house for a Welsh speaker on a site where his family had been farming the land for centuries.
  - That he had managed to buy the land in 2018 and the farm was now in a good position.
  - That the application was a re-submission - there had been no opportunity to respond to the previous application.
  - That the LPA refused the proposal and noted that there was no genuine need for two houses for the business. This was not an application for a second home - this would be the only agricultural house.
  - That there was an official need for the applicant to be on the farm - he was not expected to have to travel for hours day and night - this was immoral and far from the demands on 'staff'.
  - Although the LPA noted that the site was unsuitable, the remains of an old house could be seen on the site. It was not possible to build closer due to the Grade 2 Listed requirements on the other two houses. A site visit should be held.
  - That the business was viable and despite having slowed down a little in the past three years, it would stabilise and continue to be viable.
  - Although it was accepted that the house was slightly larger than the size of an affordable house, that this was acceptable for agricultural houses so that they met the needs of the business - in order to have space for an office, shower, etc.
  - That he, like the Community Council, supported the application.
- ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application contrary to the recommendation for the reason that nobody who lived on the farm worked on the farm - that there was no house on the business site.

In response to the proposal, the Assistant Head of Department noted that although he accepted the aspiration to obtain a houses on the farm, that the evidence highlighted that the applicant's son owned one of the houses on the farm and was a partner in the business. He reiterated that the applicant lived approximately 1.6m from the site, and that there was no justification of the need for a new house - the agricultural needs had already been met. The application was considered as a new house in the countryside without justification and should the proposal go against the recommendation, the application would have to be referred to a cooling off period.

- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- The applicant lived 1.6m from the site, but the requirements of the job made it necessary for him to live on the site.
  - Living on the farm would reduce carbon emissions.
  - This was not an application for a second home but an application for a first agricultural house.
  - The business was growing.
  - There were remains of an old dwelling on the site.

In response to the proposal, the Monitoring Officer noted that if the application was approved, there would be a need to ensure standard conditions that would bind

the proposal to agricultural use. He also highlighted that a 'need for a house' was not a sufficient reason to approve the application since a house already existed on the site to meet the need.

**RESOLVED: To approve the application contrary to the recommendation. Consequently, the application will be referred to a cooling-off period before being returned to the Committee for a final decision.**

The meeting commenced at 13:10 and concluded at 15:15

---

**CHAIR**