
PLANNING COMMITTEE 15/01/24

Present: Councillor Edgar Owen (Chair)
Councillor Elwyn Edwards (Vice-chair)

Councillors: Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Elin Hywel, Elwyn Jones, Gareth T Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Cai Larsen, Anne Lloyd Jones, Gareth Coj Parry, Gareth Roberts, John Pughe Roberts, Huw Rowlands and Gruffydd Williams

Local Members: Cllr Beca Brown and Cllr Craig ab Iago

Officers: Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Planning and the Environment), Miriam Williams (Legal Services), Keira Sweeney (Planning Manager (Development Control and Enforcement), Gwawr Hughes (Development Control Team Leader) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

Swyn Hughes and Elen Morris (Professional Trainees in Environment Planning) - observing

1. APOLOGIES

None to note

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

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

Councillor Cai Larsen (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 (C21/0564/23/LL) on the agenda as he was a Member of the Adra Management Board

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

- Councillor Elwyn Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 (C23/0463/18/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Elwyn Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.2 (C23/0864/04/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Craig ab Iago (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.3 (C22/0585/22/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Beca Brown (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 (C21/0564/23/LL) on the agenda.

3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

4. MINUTES

The Chair accepted the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on

11 December 2023, 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 C23/0463/18/LL PLAS COCH, PENISARWAUN, CAERNARFON, GWYNEDD, LL55 3PW

Retrospective application to convert an outbuilding to a holiday let.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form which included a response to concerns about the development in the context of the quality and safety of the construction work, how the building can be used without planning permission and whether appropriate insurance was in place.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a retrospective application to convert an outbuilding to a holiday let. Because the above proposal had already been completed without planning permission, a retrospective application was submitted. It was explained that the unit had been an outbuilding which was being used as an ancillary use to the Plas Coch property. The outbuilding had now been renovated and converted into one modern holiday unit.

It was highlighted that the principle of the proposal was assessed against policy TWR 2 'Holiday Accommodation' in the Local Development Plan (LDP) that permitted proposals that involved the provision of self-serviced holiday accommodation provided the proposal complied with a series of criteria, i.e.:

- i. In the case of new build accommodation, that the development is located within a development boundary, or makes use of a suitable previously developed site;
- ii. That the scale of the proposed development is appropriate given the site, the location and/or the dwelling in question;
- iii. That the proposal will not result in a loss of permanent housing stock;
- iv. That the development is not sited within a primarily residential area or does not significantly harm the residential character of an area;
- v. That the development does not lead to an over-concentration of such accommodation within the area.

When considering the criteria, it was noted that the building already existed and was not a new building - it made good use of a building that had been used as ancillary to the residential property. The building was located within the curtilage of the existing property and therefore made use of a suitable previously developed site. It was believed that the scale was reasonable as it did not create a holiday let that was excessively large, and because the unit was already being used as an outbuilding it did not lead to the loss of permanent housing stock. It was added that the unit was located in a rural area close to individual dwellings that were scattered around, and as such it did not cause significant harm to the area's residential character as there were scattered residential dwellings around the location.

It was noted that any application to convert existing buildings should include a full structural survey report by a qualified person noting that the building would be

structurally sound for conversion without requiring substantial reconstruction, adaptations or extensions. It was noted that no structural report had been included to accompany the application as the property had already been converted - there was no value to a structural report as the changes had already been completed on the site.

There was a reference to paragraph 3.2.1 TAN 23: Economic Development, which noted that the re-use and adaptation of existing rural buildings had an important role to play in meeting the needs of rural areas for commercial and industrial development, and tourism, sport and recreation. It emphasised the need for the building in question to be suitable for the proposed use.

When considering over-concentration and responding to the criterion - "that the development would not lead to an over-concentration of such accommodation in the area", it was highlighted that it should be ensured that a Business Plan was submitted as part of the application to include the necessary information in terms of the vision for the proposal and to ensure there was a market for this type of use (paragraph 6.3.67 of the JLDP). It was noted that a Business Plan had been submitted with the planning application, outlining the proposal and how the development added to the local economy through tourism. To this end it was considered that the Business Plan met this relevant criterion.

In the context of visual matters, although the proposal did not involve any change to the size of the outbuilding, there were changes to the front elevation with glass being installed on most of the elevation. As well as this, a roof-light was being installed, and other windows and doors were being repositioned, and the building's finish was completely different to that of the former building. It was not believed that the proposal would disrupt the visual amenities of the area as a whole, nor that it would have a significantly negative impact on the Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

Attention was drawn, however, to concerns received that the unit did not blend in with the landscape and that original materials had been removed and replaced by alternative materials. There were also concerns that the change to the building was causing a negative visual impact, however, the plans did not show a change in the shape or size of the original building. It was highlighted that there was a substantial change to the front elevation with the developer having installed glass along the elevation, but the elevation did not directly face nearby housing, and the elevation was not overly noticeable from the road as it was the side elevation that faced the access road. Although the original materials were not retained, the materials used were not considered unacceptable and they did not affect the character of the area significantly enough to cause a negative impact. This meant that the proposal was acceptable and met the requirements of Policy PCYFF 3, PS 20 and AT 1 of the LDP.

In the context of general and residential amenities, it was noted that although the building's appearance had changed somewhat, it was not believed that the changes were excessive, and consequently they did not affect the setting of the unit on the site. Although it could be argued that the changes made were modern changes that did not complement the rural character and feel of the area, it was not believed that this effect was substantial enough to be considered unacceptable in policy terms, since the shape and scale of the unit remained unchanged.

In the context of transport and access matters, it was noted that there were concerns regarding the location of the holiday unit on a narrow road which was used by local people. There were concerns that the holiday let use would make

this narrow lane busier and affect the amenities of nearby residents. The Transportation Unit was consulted regarding this matter and the unit had no objection regarding this element of the development. It was reported that parking spaces had been designated for the holiday unit, and the residential property had a garage on site.

Despite asking the applicant several times for a Language statement, no such statement was received. The guidance contained in Appendix 5 stated that all retail, commercial or industrial developments that are not required to submit a Welsh Language Statement/Assessment should demonstrate how consideration had been given to the language. In this case, the policies of the plan supported tourism developments according to specific criteria that relate to over-provision, therefore it was considered in this case and since the proposal complied with the requirements of the relevant policies, that the proposal was unlikely to have a harmful impact on the language. In addition, it was also possible to impose a condition to ensure that bilingual signs were used on the site and therefore it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in respect of policy PS1 of the relevant SPG.

Reference was made to several concerns received during the public consultation with some of them being non-planning issues. The Local Planning Authority had no control over the fact that the original property on the site was also holiday accommodation, as there was currently the right to change use from a residential property to holiday accommodation without planning permission. It was emphasised, in this case, that it would be the plans that were the subject of the application that would be approved, and that it was the applicant's responsibility to ensure that the development conformed to what had been permitted.

It was therefore considered that the proposal met the requirements of the relevant policies and was acceptable for approval.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:
- That there were good examples of barns that had been converted, but unfortunately this was not one of them
 - No collaboration/discussions had taken place between the applicant and the neighbours during the development
 - The community did not agree with the proposal - it was unacceptable and they disagreed with the officers' opinion
 - Imposing conditions would not address the concerns
 - That there was a change to the size and height of the original building - these statements were incorrect
 - That the suggestion that planning permission was not required was incorrect
 - That there was an impact on the privacy of neighbours - with the glass at the front of the building, the entire building appeared as if it had been lit up - this was contrary to dark sky principles
 - That access to the property was gained along a shared track - that the hedge was 'open' to the track and therefore gave the impression that people were prying around the site. The ivy, which was on the original hedge that screened the property had been removed. New screening would take years to mature
 - That local builders or materials were not used
 - That use of the hot tub created noise - this was a quiet area.

- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant made the following observations:
- That the barn was in poor condition
 - That he had converted an existing building into an AirBnB - of good standard in a good location
 - That he had invested a lot of money to deliver the enterprise
 - He had received no complaints
 - That he employed local people to clean, garden and clean the windows
 - That he had carried out a survey of the number of AirBnBs in the area
 - That he was addressing the concern of 'seeing into the property' by adapting the windows and increasing planting to screen the property better
 - His wish was to work and live locally
- ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- That this was a retrospective application
 - The property had now been converted from an outbuilding to a luxury building - the development had been underway for some time
 - Several complaints had been received over the years about the development - disturbing the peace of close neighbours and having to put up with the problems caused by transporting materials to the site
 - It was obvious from the adaptations that there was a need for planning permission
 - The Community Council had expressed its objection
 - That the adaptations were substantial - the roof and windows - were higher than the original - a full application should have been submitted
 - Photographs of the old building were needed to compare size
 - Enforcement officers visited the site in November 2022 - no information was received from this visit
 - Suggested that the Planning Committee visits the site
- d) It was proposed and seconded to undertake a site visit to attempt to get a better understanding of the impact of the development on neighbours' privacy, and to see the scale of the development in its context
- dd) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:
- That Planning regulations were put in place for a reason - there was a lack of respect here
 - Concern about a lack of sharing information and disregard of correspondence
 - That overlooking was a concern

RESOLVED: To conduct a site visit

7. APPLICATION NO C23/0864/04/LL PARC Y DERW GOED, LLANDDERFEL, GWYNEDD, LL23 7HG

Construction of new agricultural dwelling (Resubmission)

Attention was drawn to the late observations form which contained observations from the Biodiversity Unit and Natural Resources Wales

- a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application

for erecting a new agricultural dwelling and detached garage on a plot of land in Parc y Derw Goed, Llandderfel.

The site lay within an elevated position, far outside any recognised development boundary and was therefore a site in open countryside. The site was served by a byway track, and public footpath number 42 Llandderfel ran to the north of the site. The site was within a Special Landscape Area designation, and had been recognised as a Phosphate Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The fields to the south of the site had been recognised as Local Wildlife Sites.

It was explained that the application was a resubmission of application no. C23/0409/04/LL for exactly the same proposal. The application was refused on 17 July 2023 under delegated rights as the Local Planning Authority was not convinced that the proposal met the locational needs for an agricultural dwelling because of its distance from the farm.

A Design and Access Statement, letters of support from NFU Cymru and the Agri Advisor Service, together with a Business Plan from Farming Connect (confidential) were submitted as part of the application.

The application was submitted to the Committee at the local member's request.

It was reiterated, as a result of the need to preserve and protect the countryside, that very special justification was required to approve the construction of new houses there, and therefore, new dwellings in the countryside were only approved in exceptional circumstances. Those exceptional circumstances under which new dwellings in the countryside may be approved were included in Technical Advice Note 6 (TAN6): Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities - July 2010, prepared by the Welsh Assembly Government.

A Business Plan was submitted as part of the application, prepared by Farming Connect, which confirmed that the applicant had been farming in partnership with his father since 2012. The Business Plan provided the background of the enterprise together with details about the size of the holding, stock numbers, labour requirements and financial details about the enterprise's viability. The proposal would therefore be a second dwelling on an established farm, with the applicant running the farm with his father. Reference was made to the following criteria, noting when considering the need that:

- a) *there was a clearly established existing functional need;*
- b) *the need related to a full-time worker, and did not relate to a part-time requirement;*
- c) *the enterprise concerned had been established for at least three years, profitable for at least one of them, and both the enterprise and the business need for the job, was currently financially sound, and had a clear prospect of remaining so;*
- d) *the functional need could not be fulfilled by another dwelling or by converting an existing suitable building that was already on the land holding comprising the enterprise, or any other existing accommodation in the locality which was suitable and available for occupation by the worker concerned;*
- e) *other normal planning requirements, for example location and access, had been satisfied.*

From the information submitted, it appeared that the applicant met the requirements of tests a), b) and c) noted above, and as noted there are no suitable traditional buildings that could be converted into a dwelling on the holding to meet test d).

It was highlighted that the site in question was poor quality agricultural land, where there was an existing track and a water and electricity supply in proximity. It was argued that the site nestled naturally behind a hillock, was well-screened and where biodiversity could be improved. It was added that the applicant wanted to avoid locating the dwelling in a prominent position in the landscape, and considered this to be a sheltered, well-screened location. The site was around 650 metres as the crow flies from Derw Goed farmhouse and the associated farm buildings.

Whilst the explanation was appreciated, the Planning Authority had not been fully convinced that it would not be possible to develop on some of the disregarded locations, such as on land near the farmhouse or on other locations not shown in the valley closer to the farm. It was considered that there were other options available for monitoring the land, such as CCTV. It was believed that the location of the proposed dwelling encroached unreasonably into the countryside and was excessively detached from the farm holding which would encourage fragmentation of the farm, and was therefore contrary to the requirements of sections 4.7.1 and 4.12 of TAN 6.

No open market valuation (red book) was received as part of the application. Policy TAN 6 stated that new dwellings in the countryside would only be approved in exceptional circumstances. The Local Planning Authority had not been truly convinced that this was the most suitable location for an agricultural dwelling without assurance that the property would be affordable in the long term. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policy PCYFF 1 and PS17 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan and sections 4.7.1, 4.12 and 4.13 of Technical Advice Note 6 - Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities (2010) which ensured that new dwellings in open countryside may only be permitted in specific and exceptional circumstances.

It was noted that design and visual amenities, residential amenities, and road matters were acceptable and conditions had been proposed for managing the Biodiversity matters and overcoming the drainage matters.

In conclusion, it was noted that the proposal remained contrary to the locational needs that are set out in TAN 6 because the agricultural dwelling would be too separate from the existing farm. It was also questioned whether this location could ensure that the property could be affordable in the long term, should the agricultural use cease. The previous application for exactly the same proposal was refused, and although a little more justification had been presented on the current application, the officers had not been truly convinced that this was the most suitable location for an agricultural dwelling. Although some matters relating to amenities and roads were acceptable, the proposal did not meet all the relevant policy considerations. These concerns were stated in a response to the pre-application enquiry and in the previous refusal, but the applicant decided to proceed to resubmit the application. The recommendation was to refuse the application.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent made the following observations:
- That the farm had belonged to the family for 80 years
 - That the need had been proved
 - That the location of the application had been carefully considered - cases of dogs killing sheep and of the land being driven over - the location of the house would be a means of keeping an eye on activity over 24 hours
 - That the site was central to the farm's land - to keep an eye on stock that was out all year

- That the site was in a sheltered position
 - That an access track existed
 - That the site was not visible from the road
 - That building the dwelling would reduce the need to move and travel
 - That the fields closest to the farm were productive fields (grazing and silage)
 - That the location called for a presence to overcome the problems of incidents and provided a home for a young, local family
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- That the site was not visible from anywhere but the farm
 - That the applicant had complied with biodiversity matters
 - The location was a matter of opinion
 - That another application had been granted with two miles between the farm and the proposed site - how was that application therefore in line with the policy and this one in contravention?
- ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application contrary to the recommendation - that the dwelling was in an ideal location to protect stock and reduce carbon footprint
- d) In response to a question regarding a condition to ensure agricultural occupancy, the Assistant Head stated that a condition would have to be set that would limit the use to agriculture only together with a condition that would comply with the conditions of affordable housing/affordable price and standard conditions.

RESOLVED: To approve the application contrary to the recommendation, subject to the following conditions:

1. In accordance with the plans.
2. Five years.
3. Materials/finishes.
4. Rural enterprise use condition.
5. Restricted to C3 use only.
6. Landscaping.
7. Biodiversity enhancements.
8. Details of the boundary fence.
9. A Welsh name for the development.

Note
SuDS
Protect the public footpath.

8. APPLICATION NO C22/0585/22/LL LAND ADJACENT TO OXTON VILLA FFORDD HAEARN BACH, PENYGROES, LL54 6NY

Application for erecting an affordable dwelling with access, parking and associated landscaping (amended plan).

Attention was drawn to the late observations form which contained observations from the Policy Unit.

- a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application for erecting an affordable dwelling with access and a parking space, together with associated landscaping. It was noted that the site was located within an agricultural

field on the outskirts of the village of Penygroes along a narrow road that turned into a public footpath at the far end that ran between the field that was the subject of the application and the last house in the village (Glaslyn). It was explained that the application was a resubmission of that refused under reference C21/0430/22/LL, and previously C20/0853/22/LL.

It was noted that the proposal submitted included an e-mail from the agent, dated 15.07.2022, attaching a Tai Teg letter dated 28 November 2019, stating as follows: "Your application has been approved. You can now proceed to search for a property on the Tai Teg website and to make an application should you find a suitable property. Please note:- it is important that you read the following in order to understand what needs to be completed should you apply for the property." It did not appear that the applicant had been assessed in detail for constructing his own affordable house and although the Council requested further evidence of the applicant's need for an affordable self-build house with the application, it did not receive a response in the lifetime of the application, and these discussions went back to March 2023.

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

In the context of the principle of the development, it was explained that the site was located outside the Penygroes development boundary as noted in the LDP. Policy PCYFF 1 ('Development Boundaries') stated that proposals outside development boundaries would be refused unless they were in accordance with specific policies in the Plan or national planning policies or that the proposal showed that its location in the countryside was essential. Policy TAI 16 'Exception Sites' stated that provided it could be shown that there was a proven local need for affordable housing which could not be delivered within a reasonable time-scale on a market site within the development boundary, as an exception, proposals for 100% affordable housing plans on sites immediately adjacent to development boundaries that formed a logical extension to the settlement would be granted.

It did not appear from the information submitted with the application that the application site touched the development boundary, with a gap between the site and the development boundary (which appeared to be a public footpath). In planning policy terms the site was defined as a location in open countryside and, therefore, was not relevant to be considered in terms of Policy TAI 16, 'Exception Sites', which was supported in the Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Affordable Housing'.

In this respect, paragraph 6.4.36 of the LDP stated that developments in the open countryside had to satisfy national policy and Technical Advice Note 6 in terms of meeting requirements to be classed as a rural enterprise dwelling. No such justification appeared to have been presented with this application.

It was highlighted that house prices had increased substantially since the previous application and at that time, the Housing Strategic Unit confirmed that a discount of 45% would be required in order to make the property affordable. It was noted that a 45% discount on the £225,000 price would bring the price down to £123,750, and this could be considered reasonable for a new, single intermediate property. Nevertheless, there were concerns about increasing house prices, and the price of the property/land could increase substantially in the future to a level where it could be argued that the property would not be affordable, regardless of the discount, and an application to lift the 106 agreement could be received. It was noted that the LDP only supported proposals for affordable units where it could be ensured that

they remained affordable in perpetuity.

It was also noted that the application site (including the proposed house and its curtilage) was very large, and there was concern that providing a curtilage of this size would be likely to ultimately increase the value of the property, meaning that the house would not be affordable in terms of its price. On this basis, the proposal was considered to be contrary to the requirements of policy TAI 15 of the LDP and the SPG Affordable Housing in respect of securing an affordable unit in perpetuity and the floor area shown.

In the context of biodiversity matters (including conditions if an application was to be granted), transport and access matters, visual, residential and general matters together with linguistic matters, it was noted that the development was acceptable, but as a whole, it was considered that the proposal for erecting one affordable dwelling on the outskirts of the village of Penygroes was unacceptable, and was contrary to the requirements of policies PCYFF 1, TAI 15, TAI 16, the SPG Affordable Housing and TAN 6 in respect of the site's eligibility as an exception site and the need for a new house in open countryside, the size of the curtilage, together with the lack of confirmation of the number of bedrooms that would satisfy the need/size of the property; and criteria 1, 2 and 3 of policy PCYFF 2 in terms of compliance with local and national policies and development density. The recommendation was to refuse the application.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent made the following observations:
- That the application was for an affordable house from the same applicant as before
 - That the land had been given to him by a family member
 - That the application had been submitted to the Committee in December 2021 and the Local Member at the time was supportive
 - That there had been a detailed discussion on the application during the Committee and that a proposal had been made to approve, stating the observation that the application was not in open countryside
 - That the site was located approximately 1.5m from the development boundary with a public footpath running between the boundary and the site
 - That concern had been expressed that the proposal was too large in size - the applicant had reduced the proposal's floor area size and resubmitted the application
 - That discussions had been held with Tai Teg but it seemed that the discussion was going round in circles because of the elements of self-build and the elements of affordable housing - the applicant was trying his best to overcome this
 - Should the application be approved, a 106 agreement would remain on the house for the future
 - That the applicant had responded to the Committee's requirements
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- That he encouraged the Committee to go against the recommendation, to ensure fairness
 - That a young local man wanted to live and raise a family in his community - he would use Gwynedd services, Gwynedd schools and support the local economy
 - That there was a lack of housing for local people When an option arose to keep people locally in our communities he was eager to support this

- The site was not in the middle of the countryside - it was between two houses - this was a case of filling a gap
- The development boundary did not follow a straight line
- That an access track and services already existed there
- That the size of the house was too large was only a matter of opinion
- A request for the Committee to support the application; to allow the applicant to remain local and raise a family in his community

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

Reasons:

- That the plot of land was not 'in the middle of the countryside'
- It complied with PCYFF1 TAI 15 and 16 - proximity to the development boundary

In response, the Assistant Head stated that sufficient evidence had not been submitted that the applicant was eligible for an affordable house and that the application in question was for a large house (which was not affordable). He also added that he had not received written evidence of the Tai Teg situation. He suggested that the decision could be deferred and to seek clarity on the situation.

d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:

- Would it be possible to separate the land from the property and make the plot of land for the development smaller?
- Would an application for three bedrooms be too big? Exceeded the threshold?
- Why should affordable housing be small in size for local people?
- Would erecting a house on this site extend the boundary?

RESOLVED

- **To defer the application in order to receive written evidence of the applicant's situation with Tai Teg.**
- **Consider reducing the floor area of the house.**
- **Consider options to separate the land/reduce the size of the land plot.**

9. APPLICATION NO C21/0564/23/LL LAND BY GLYNTWROG INN, LLANRUG, CAERNARFON, LL55 4AN

Application for the erection of three affordable residential units (two houses and a bungalow)

Attention was drawn to the late observations form which contained observations from the Strategic Housing Unit.

a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application for the erection of three social affordable houses, a pair of two-storey houses and one bungalow. It was intended to construct a new entrance to create an access road within the site as well as provide eight parking spaces and a bin collection area. It was explained that the application was originally submitted for four two-storey houses but the plan was amended to three following public objections and the officers' concerns regarding the plan. The application was submitted to committee because of the

local interest and objection to the application.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was noted that the proposed houses were located between the site of the Glyntwrog public house and a single-storey semi-detached house known as Bryn Siriol. It was added that the site was on a slight slope and had not been designated for a specific use; the site was outside the development boundary of Llanrug, but immediately abutted the development boundary of Llanrug as defined in the LDP. It was explained that Llanrug had been identified as a Local Service Centre in the LDP but since the site was located outside the development boundary, policy TAI 16 ('Exception Sites') applied to the proposal. Policy TAI 16 enabled housing developments on sites that were outside, but abutted the development boundary but it had to be ensured that the proposal complied effectively with Policy requirements.

The indicative supply level of housing for Llanrug over the Plan period, as noted in Appendix 5 of the LDP, was 61 units (including a 10% 'slippage allowance', which meant that the method of calculating the figure had taken into account potential unforeseen circumstances which could influence the provision of housing, e.g. land ownership matters, infrastructure restrictions, etc.). During the period 2011 to 2023, a total of 51 units had been completed in Llanrug (37 on windfall sites and 14 on housing designations T44 and T45). The windfall land bank, i.e. sites with extant planning permission on sites not designated for housing, in April 2023, was five units. One unit on designation T44 (Cae'r Ysgol) remained in the land bank (started in April 2023). This therefore was a shortfall of four units.

Based on this information, and since this development would not mean that Llanrug exceeded its indicative supply level, there was no need for a justification based on the number of houses in Llanrug. Nevertheless, as the site was located outside the development boundary and could be considered as a rural exception site, policy PCYFF 1 and TAI 16 also asked for justification.

Policy TAI 15 and SPG Affordable Housing, required that new houses were of a size, scale and design that were in keeping with an affordable house. In accordance with the needs of PPW, confirmation was received from the agent that the units would meet the Welsh Design Quality Standards and also met housing standards in perpetuity. Although the bungalow would have a larger floor area than what was approved in the SPG for affordable units, because it was a unit for special needs, it was considered that there was reasonable justification for the extra floor area. As the houses would be provided by a social landlord, the units would be protected as affordable units in perpetuity and this could be ensured via a 106 agreement.

In the context of amenity open spaces, it was highlighted that Policy ISA 5 ('The provision of open spaces within new housing developments') sought to ensure the provision of open spaces within new housing developments of 10 or more units where the existing open spaces could not meet the needs of the proposed housing development. As this proposal was below the threshold noted in the policy, it was irrelevant to consider this aspect.

In the context of visual matters, it was noted that the development boundary of the village of Llanrug was set in two parts and the development pattern was relatively fragmented around the site. The proposed site was located near a small cluster of houses surrounded by a development boundary and the Glyntwrog public house which was outside the development boundary. The buildings opposite the public house were inside the boundary. The field was currently empty and contributed towards a sense of open area between the existing houses and the public house.

Nevertheless, the void was not substantial and the nature of the development followed the area's development pattern with the public house and the junction a boundary which provided a sense of a natural end to the village.

In the context of general and residential amenities, there was concern about the impact of the original plan due to the height and location of the houses disrupting the amenities of a nearby house, Bryn Siriol. Following discussions, amended plans were received with the plan reduced to three houses with a bungalow alongside Bryn Siriol. With the land running upward from the highway on a slope, levels were shown on the amended plans which showed that there was a proposal to reduce the height of the site to the rear. As a result, the ridge of the bungalow would be around the same height as Bryn Siriol.

In the context of transport and access matters, it was highlighted that the Transportation Unit had concerns about the original plans but after receiving amended plans, they did not have an objection to the proposal. It was considered, as the proposal was only for three additional houses, that a development on this small scale would not create substantial additional movements on the highway. It was also noted that during the consultation period, a large number of concerns were received about safety in this part of the village and the fact that a number of accidents had happened here in the past. It appeared that the concerns mainly derived from the speed of traffic along the adjacent county road, as well as vehicles parking along the county road. The speed limit had now been reduced to 20mph and alleviated the concerns.

This was a proposal for a social affordable housing development designed to meet the needs of the local housing market and located on a site near the village's development boundary, and the site could be considered as a suitable rural exception site. Despite acknowledging the observations received, it was considered that the plan was acceptable on principle, and that it complied with the requirements of relevant local and national planning policies.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:
- That he had highlighted his concerns although those were not reflected in the report
 - Any excavation work would affect the sewerage system and the site of the septic tank
 - That the development was an over-development - neither the layout nor its design conformed to the typical pattern of the village
 - The development would create the impression that the village was expanding
 - That the development setting was close to the Bryn Siriol boundary - an impact on neighbours' privacy
 - The access did not meet standards - a bus stop would need to be moved and there was a ditch nearby
 - That the adjacent highway was a very busy one. There are no parking spaces.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant made the following observations:
- That a pre-planning application discussion for four houses had been held in August 2019 and that the observations received at that point had been incorporated in the current proposal.
 - The development would fill a gap between Glyntwrog and Bryn Siriol -

offering three affordable houses - a reasonably-sized extension.

- That the housing type responded to local need
- That discussions had been held with neighbours to alleviate concerns - this had led to reducing the number of houses from four to three which would reduce impact and also to reduce the height of the roofs
- That an application to relocate the sewerage system had been proposed, but the proposal had been rejected by the neighbours
- That the current plan had been designed around the septic tank - enclosed by a fence and access secured
- The bus stop would not have to be moved - no impact there
- That there was a great need for local housing
- That the developer was a local businessman, employing local workers
- There was good visibility to the county road
- The application provided three affordable houses for three local families

ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:

- There was a sense of a 'full village' - a lot of recent development
- That the 20mph speed limit reduction alleviated concerns
- Accepted the adaptation to the septic tank
- That the proposal to put the sewerage system on the main system needed to be formalised in order to calm the concerns of the residents of Bryn Siriol
- There was a need for affordable/social housing in the area - the waiting list for social housing was long
- Accepted that there was a possibility of transferring the development to a Housing Association - a suggestion of setting a condition to ensure this
- Welcomed the inclusion of a bungalow in the plans that had been adapted for disability needs

In response to the comments about the septic tank, the Planning Manager noted that a condition could be included to protect the location of the septic tank which would ensure no further development.

d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application

dd) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:

- Welcomed the bungalow for special needs
- Happy with the intention and the conditions
- Welcomed the social housing development
- Would it be possible to move the septic tank - the location was not ideal

RESOLVED To delegate powers to the Head of Environment Department to approve the application, subject to a 106 agreement to transfer the units to a housing association, along with the following conditions:

1. In accordance with the plans
2. Five years
3. Land drainage
4. Materials
5. Removal of permitted development rights
6. Welsh Water Condition
7. Highway conditions (completion of entrance, parking, estate road and bin collection area)
8. Landscaping

- 9. Biodiversity enhancements**
- 10. Details of the boundary fence**
- 11. A Welsh name for the development/estate road and the individual dwellings**
- 12. Restricted to C3 use only**
- 13. A condition for protecting the septic tank area**

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 2.40 pm

CHAIRMAN