
PLANNING COMMITTEE 3/4/17

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

Councillors: Stephen Churchman (substitute), Simon Glyn, Gwen Griffith, Dyfrig Jones, Michael Sol Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams

Others invited: Councillors R. H. Wyn Williams, Aled Lloyd Evans, John Wynn Jones, Jason Humphreys and Anwen Davies

Also in attendance: Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Planning Manager) Gwawr Hughes (Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Officer - Transportation), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Lowri Haf Evans and Bethan Adams (Member Support Officers).

Apologies: Councillors Endaf Cooke, June Marshall and John Wyn Williams

1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

- (a) Councillor Dyfrig Jones declared a personal interest in item 5.6 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/1686/46/LL) as family members ran a caravan park in Llangwnnadl

Councillor Hefin Williams declared a personal interest in relation to item 5.10 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0094/40/AM) because of a business contact

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 stated that they were local members in relation to the items noted:
- Councillor R. H. Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee) in item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C14/0215/39/LL);
 - Councillor Aled Lloyd Evans (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1154/41/LL);
 - Councillor John Wynn Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1656/11/LL);
 - Councillor Eirwyn Williams (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.5 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1684/35/LL);
 - Councillor Simon Glyn (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.6 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1686/46LL);
 - Councillor Jason Humphreys (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.7 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0005/44/LL);
 - Councillor Gruffydd Williams (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.8 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0015/42/LL);
 - Councillor Anwen J. Davies (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.10 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1154/41/LL);

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

2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 13 March 2017, as a true record.

3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

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

RESOLVED

1. Application number C16/0638/39/LL - Cilfan, Lôn Gwydryn, Abersoch

An amended design for an extension approved by planning permission number C14/0215/39/LL

- (a) The Planning Manager expanded on the background to the application, noting that in the meeting of the Planning Committee dated 07 November 2016 it was resolved to defer considering the application in order to resolve inconsistencies between the plans submitted for consideration and the building being constructed on the site.

Following a complaint received about the development in which it was stated that the height of the side extension was higher than the approved plan, an Enforcement Officer visited the site to discuss the issue with the applicant and a part-retrospective application was received (amended plan 13 February 2017). It was explained that the planning permission was given under reference C14//0215/39/LL.

It was noted that the active planning permission that existed for the site was an important planning consideration when considering the exiting application. It was highlighted that the Council had already approved a similar development on the site and it was not considered that the difference to the design was sufficient to justify refusing the application. The proposal did not significantly impair the area's visual amenities or those of the nearby residents. It also conformed to all the policies noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:-
- That he objected on the basis of reduced amenities
 - That the development was a very restricted one
 - That the amended plans were misleading with regard to impact
 - A wall within the amended plans was higher than the original wall which would be double the size and have a substantial / oppressive impact on the amenities of nearby residents
 - There would be a substantial reduction in natural light and heat into nearby houses
 - The visual impact would be dreadful and detrimental
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:
- That he was satisfied with the content of the report and accepted the conditions
 - That the building would look acceptable once completed
 - That he looked forward to settling down in Abersoch with family close by
 - He ensured that the amendments to the plans would not affect the neighbours in any way
 - There would be no overlooking as there was no east-facing window
 - That an application had been submitted for a balcony as the garden was small
 - That the conservatory had been moved approximately one foot as it was too close to the boundary because it was not possible to walk to the rear of the house
 - That he thanked the officers for their guidance

- (ch) The following main points were made by the local member who supported the application (not a member of this Planning Committee):
- That the principle of the development was acceptable
 - That he welcomed the consideration of the Well-being Act
 - That the AONB Officer supported the application
 - That this committee had approved previous applications.
 - That the wall was included in the original plans
 - That he accepted the report
- (d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- dd) In response to a question regarding the size and scale of the wall, the Planning Manager stated that the officers had discussed the plans in detail and that the situation was very similar to that which had been previously approved.
- (e) During the subsequent discussion members made the following main points:
- The application included minor changes only

RESOLVED to approve the application

1. In accordance with the plans
2. Slate to match
3. Finish to be agreed
4. Details of the 'louvres' on the eastern elevation of the property to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority within a month of the date of this approval and to remain so henceforward.
5. No further new window openings or doorways to be allowed, with the exception of those shown on a revised plan.
6. Windows of the bathroom and first floor on the western elevation must be glazed with opaque glass before the property is occupied and must remain so henceforward.
7. Limit the height of the wall along the eastern boundary of the site to 1.7 metres.

2. Application number C16/1154/41/LL - Penarth Fawr, Chwillog, Pwllheli, Gwynedd

An amended design to the one refused under C16/0705/41/LL to convert an outbuilding into a four bedroom affordable house.

Some members of the Committee had visited the site before the meeting.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that this was a resubmission of a previous application which had been refused under delegated rights. It was highlighted that this was a full planning application to convert existing outbuildings from agricultural/storage use to residential use. It was also noted that the application had been postponed until November 2016 because the applicant wanted to weigh up the situation following the publication of the report.

The application had been amended since its original submission and the plans now show an intention to convert part of the buildings into a house which would comprise three bedrooms, kitchen/dining room, lounge and bathroom. The proposal originally indicated that part of the existing building would be demolished and reconstructed leaving a space between the dwelling and the outbuilding. This had now been changed to include a garage and new storage area attached to the house.

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee at the Local Member's request as he was of the opinion that the building was suitable for conversion to an affordable house for a young local family and that there was a shortage of such housing in the area.

Reference was made to the relevant policies (specifically C4 and CH12) and also to the responses received during the consultation period. It was explained that Policy C4 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan approved plans to adapt buildings for re-use subject to compliance with criteria, which included ensuring that the building was of permanent construction and was structurally sound and that it could be converted without major reconstruction work. It was noted that walls on the site had been built at different times; and that a structural survey was submitted with the application. It was highlighted that the report confirmed the need to demolish some buildings entirely as they were in poor condition and that other buildings needed local demolition and reconstruction work as well as some smartening.

As a result, it was considered that the proposal neither complied with the requirements of policy C4 in the form it had been submitted nor did it comply with the requirements of the SPG 'Conversion of buildings in open countryside and rural villages' as none of the buildings that were included in the application were suitable to be converted.

In terms of establishing the principle, it was also required that the proposal be considered in accordance with policy CH12 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan. The key part of the policy stated:

"in rural villages and in the countryside conversions of buildings for residential use will not be permitted unless it is proven first that a suitable economic use cannot be secured for the building..."

Only if there is compliance with the first part of the policy could the associated four criteria be considered. Attention was drawn to the opening sentence, which had been confirmed at a relatively recent appeal with an application in Glasinfryn, of 'ensuring economic use'. Evidence submitted by the agent and the applicant on the failure to ensure a suitable economic use for the building which was the subject of the application was insufficient, despite the advice given prior to submitting the application for the need to secure this. The information submitted with the application including additional information submitted by the applicant was very general with no evidence of any real attempt made to market the buildings for suitable economic use. It was noted that the applicant/agent had stated that the buildings were not suitable or safe for renting or for modern agricultural requirements.

Referring to the consideration given to the site for holiday use, the applicant highlighted that there was a substantial number of holiday accommodation nearby, and a letter was also sent by the owner of a nearby site referring to the lack of benefit from letting holiday homes in this specific area. The applicant was thus of the opinion that this was sufficient research and evidence. It was highlighted that the buildings had not been advertised as being for sale or to let, and no reference was made to prices and marketing period. As a result, it was considered that firm evidence did not exist to demonstrate that it was not possible to ensure suitable economic use of the buildings.

It was noted that the council, prior to submitting the previous application had presented it to the agent; and that, furthermore, had clearly stated through letter and verbally the need to prove that suitable economic use could not be ensured for the buildings before considering their use as a residential unit. The agent was given clear direction and guidance about the need to comply with the requirements of this relevant policy. This was not to say that the proposal was impossible, only that relevant evidence was required to show that real effort had been made to market the building for economic purposes.

It was highlighted that this was an application for an affordable house and that Tai Teg had confirmed that the applicant had proved the need for an affordable house. It was confirmed that Tai Teg would not be assessing any other element of the proposal. If the proposal were acceptable in every other respect, there would be a requirement to bind the development to a 106 Agreement 'community local need for an affordable house'. As the proposal was contrary to several policies, the agent/applicant was not requested to confirm this aspect.

With the concerns having been brought to the agent's attention and that this advice had been consistent, the recommendation was to refuse the application for the reasons noted in the report.

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

- That the building stuck out 2.4m only, more than what was acceptable
- Only 10% of the site needed to be rebuilt - this had been noted in the report
- The storage area was not part of the plans
- The proposal was not a service / community resource and, therefore, does not require marketing as a farm building would not lead to a loss of Service / resource
- Had looked into economic ideas, but that this would have led to expenditure - too expensive to go down this route.
- The only possible use was residential
- Reference was made to a similar application that was granted without marketing. Why, therefore, was there no consistency?

c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), supported the application and he made the following main points:

- Members were reminded that they had recently adopted the Rural Gwynedd Development Project as part of the Council's Plan (2017-2018) and would, therefore, need to look beyond planning policies
- It was highlighted that the Community Council was supportive and had expressed disappointment that local people were not being allowed to use buildings on their own land
- That the applicant qualified for an affordable house
- That nearby residents supported the application
- That rebuilding 10% of the site was neither substantial nor entire
- That he disagreed with the material planning considerations
- In the context of marketing, a letter had been submitted expressing the lack of economic / agricultural value to the buildings
- That the marketing argument was unreasonable - this did not involve a shop / public house / surgery and the 'loss of a community resource' was, therefore, irrelevant
- That the site was vacant
- Their intention was to run an agricultural business
- A request for the Members to consider whether the proposal was logical

(ch) In response to the above observations, the Planning Manager noted that it was an application for an affordable house that had been submitted, rather than an application for a farmhouse / rural enterprise and the proposal had, therefore, been considered under those material policies. Usually, in such circumstances, the site would need to be marketed for a period of approximately 12 months. In response to an observation to rebuild 10% of the site, it was noted that this had been included in the agent's late observations. It was explained that officers had looked at the size of the development in its entirety, which also

included a storage area and garage, not only residential accommodation. This was, therefore, the equivalent of approximately one third of the development being newly built.

- d) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.
- (dd) During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:
- That members had visited the site and had, therefore, been given the opportunity to see the condition of the structures
 - Building control was likely to encourage the demolition of the buildings
 - An improved plan was required that would comply with the policies
 - Sad to see derelict buildings remaining derelict because of policies - but these policies must be adhered to
 - How would it be possible to convert the buildings for economic benefit? It was a remote site and, therefore, much doubt existed as to its suitability as a holiday unit.
 - That access to the site was narrow and, thus, unsuitable for heavy lorries, should it need to be run as an agricultural business - narrowness of the lanes was possible evidence that it was unsuitable for business use
 - Converting it into a residential unit with a 106 agreement would possibly be an economic element - keeping a young family in the locality
 - What would the other optional economic use be? Likely that the most obvious option would be farming.
 - The application was a good one and should not be disregarded
 - The building had not been used for 40 years - evidence, therefore, that it had not had much economic use
 - That the property had been owned by the family and was suitable to be converted into a house - an ideal location for a young family
 - The derelict buildings were an eye sore
 - The people of Gwynedd must be put at the centre of decisions and, therefore, this family needed the opportunity to have a home and the opportunity to run a business of their own
 - It would be foolish to propose a period of marketing in order to give others the opportunity
- e) In response to the above observations the Senior Manager noted that no evidence of testing the market / possible economic use had been submitted, despite the advice given to the applicant's agent on several occasions. Unfortunately, as the application had not responded to this advice, the recommendation was to refuse. It was suggested that it would be possible to consider setting a 12 month period for it to be appropriately marketed. Although much talk had been about ideas and the intention to run a business, no information / evidence had been submitted in support of this.

RESOLVED to defer the application so that the applicant can submit evidence of marketing over an appropriate period

3. Application number C16/1430/03/HT - Land near Y Ddôl, Tanygrisiau, Blaenau Ffestiniog

Erection of pole with three antenna, a total height of 20m, installation of one communications satellite together with three equipment cabinets, with one cabinet to include a meter with a surrounding 2m high fence

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received

- a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and that the intention was for the mast to be in a dull olive colour rather than brown olive as noted in the report - the intention was for the cabinet to be green.

It was noted that the site was located on the outskirts of the village of Tanygrisiau, within a site used for parking / recycling bins. A number of responses had been received from the public on issues involving the effects of rays, proximity to houses and the primary school, and that the development was unnecessary, and the visual impact it would have on the area.

It was highlighted that the main material planning considerations were the visual impact and the impact on health. It was explained, with this type of development, that the proposed structure would be partly visible from public places as it would need to be in a fairly open location to ensure that it would work to its full capacity. Nevertheless, the Local Planning Authority had some concern regarding the visual impact of the development, especially from the direction of Tanygrisiau; but considering that Snowdonia National Park did not object to the proposal, and considering the contents of the Visual Impact Assessment on the Landscape, it was considered that the impact would not be significant in this instance. It was noted that the finish of the mast was acceptable because of the nature of the land that formed the backdrop to this development, and it was considered that, with this finish, it would blend in better.

A document was submitted as part of the application which confirmed that the development had been certified as being in compliance with ICNIRP guidelines, which are the standard guidelines for assessing impact on health. Although concerns raised were acknowledged within the consultation period, this proposal was not considered to be contrary to national policies or the Unitary Plan and there was no need for further information to assess the possible impact of the development.

Having considered the above and all the relevant planning matters, including local and national policies and guidances, the proposal was considered to be acceptable and in keeping with the requirements of the relevant policies.

- b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), supported the application
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- That 3G and 4G service in this area was very poor
 - That residents and businesses were not receiving signal inside their houses / businesses
 - That many now depended on their mobile phones for internet access
 - It would not be effective were it to be installed below the treeline
 - That no convincing evidence existed to support the claim that the rays affected health
 - That there was a demand and a need for the development.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:
- That the development was a significant improvement
 - That the development improved facilities in the area
 - With a number of people hiking / mountaineering in the area, the development would facilitate the work of the Rescue and Emergency Services Teams
 - There was a need to ensure that the recycling site would not be lost

RESOLVED to approve the application

1. Time
2. Comply with the plans
3. Remove the mast and associated equipment and restore the land should its use end.
4. Condition regarding the colour of the mast and the antenna/satellite
5. Condition regarding the colour of the cabinet and fence
6. Agree to a landscape scheme and rhododendron disposal

4. Application number C16/1656/65/LL Plot 1, Euston Road, Bangor

Amended application to erect a new building in order to provide 48 living units for students

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background to the application, noting that this was a full application to construct a new building in order to provide 48 living units with 57 bed spaces for students. The units would provide 45 self-contained studio units and three cluster living units each with four bedrooms each and one communal kitchen and lounge.

The proposal involved erecting a three-storey building opposite houses 1-10 on Euston Road which would step down in keeping with the Euston Road slope to a four-storey section opposite the gable ends of the houses of Ffordd Denman, close to Bangor City centre and within the development boundary. The Railway Club building which previously stood on the site had been demolished and cleared through a previous permission (on appeal) in order to erect a three-storey building to create a total of 27 flats with 39 student bed spaces. Subsequently, permission was granted to amend this permission by amending the internal layout of the building to provide 29 units with 47 bed spaces; the proposal in question involved 48 units (57 bed spaces); an increase, therefore, of 10 bed spaces. Consequently, there was a need to weigh up the material considerations when determining whether the principle of the proposed development in this particular location was acceptable or not.

In the context of general and residential amenities, it was noted that the design and size of the building had changed since the previous permissions. It was explained that the building would continue to step down the Euston Road, in accordance with the existing permission; that the height of the ridge would be lower than that of the houses located opposite (numbers 1-10 Euston Road) and would be in keeping with the houses that directly abut it (11 and 12 Euston Road). The design and materials would be in keeping with the traditional design of the houses in the area. It would look like a development of a residential terrace/flats in terms of its size, form and design.

With an increase of 10 additional bed spaces, it was not considered that this would significantly harm the residential amenities of nearby residents with regard to noise or disturbance. A students' management plan was received as part of the application in order to show management of the students and to ensure that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the surrounding area. It was considered reasonable to impose a condition to ensure that the building be managed in accordance with the submitted plans.

Although the concern raised by objectors was acknowledged, the plan was not considered to be an over-development of the site. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable and complied with local and national policies and guidance.

- (b) The following main points were made by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee):
- That the proposal was an over-development. The developer had already been granted permission for 47 and that this was sufficient

- The site was not convenient for Coleg Menai students and was not on a local bus route
 - He suggested that the developer install parking bays to assist with the situation in the community
 - Needed to consider the argument that students' hostels released houses for families in the city. Suggestion to assess how many houses in multiple occupancy would be returned to use
 - That he objected the application
- c) Proposed and seconded to refuse the application, contrary to the recommendation on the grounds of over-development.
- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:
- That the Local Member's comments needed to be considered
 - Agreed that work needed to be carried out to assess the situation of houses in multiple occupancy
 - Accept the suggestion to ensure additional parking spaces
 - That the proposal was an over-development and, consequently, there would be an increase in noise, waste and an impact on local residents' facilities and amenities
 - When would it be acceptable to say enough is enough with regard to the development of students' hostels?
 - Cumulative impact a cause for concern
 - That amending plans for a third time was frustrating
 - 10 additional bed spaces was not a great change to what already existed
 - That the demand for student housing was on the increase

RESOLVED to refuse the application on the grounds that it is an over-development which would have an impact on the general amenities of local residents.

5. Application number C16/1684/35/LL White House, Radcliffe Road, Cricieth

Application for the erection of five houses including one affordable house

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received

- a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that it was a full application to construct five two-storey houses on a plot of land at the rear of an existing dwelling located off the unclassified Ty'n Llan Road in Cricieth. An outline application for the proposal had previously been approved. It was noted that the land formed part of the White House's substantial gardens and, at one time, a tennis court.

The proposed development included widening the entrance and existing access road, and adding to this road and creating a new estate road; create individual accesses to the five houses off the estate road with formal gardens to the front, side and rear; four open market houses and one affordable house.

It was noted that the legal department had issued instruction for a new 106 agreement to be created as this was a full application rather than an application to agree upon reserved matters which usually followed outline permissions.

The site's layout was approved including the location of the houses and the arrangements for transport on the previous outline application. Because of the site's location among other houses, it was not considered that there would be an unacceptable detrimental impact on the form and character of the townscape. It was considered that the general layout of the

site continued to be acceptable, and that the size of the houses were suitable in terms of retaining the area's general appearances.

It was highlighted that trees and vegetation had been cleared from the site (but not the protected ones) and that landscaping had not been included as part of the application. It was considered that it would be acceptable (and a general arrangement) to include a landscaping condition, the details of which would be agreed in due course. Along with appropriate conditions to safeguard the protected trees, the Council's Biodiversity Officer did not have any objection to the proposal.

In accordance with the 'Planning and the Welsh Language' supplementary planning guidance, an update to the community and linguistic impact assessment was submitted with the previous application which included specific information regarding the area and local population and the development's impact on relevant matters. The information was assessed by the Joint Planning Policy Unit, and it was confirmed (as was confirmed in the outline application which had already been approved) that the proposed development was not likely to have a detrimental impact on the Welsh language.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application noted the following main points:
- Trees had been cleared - need to ensure the privacy of the nearby houses.
 - Verbal commitment made by the applicant, but there was a request to include 'reinstating of privacy' as a condition to the application
- (c) Taking advantage of the opportunity to speak, the applicant noted the following points:-
- That he was willing to prepare a landscaping scheme and share the details with the objector in order to ensure that this satisfied the privacy needs
 - That a comprehensive planning scheme had been created for the site
 - A name for the development is yet to be approved
 - Bilingual signs would be installed on the site
 - Good cooperation with the officers to ensure that the development met policy requirements
 - That he took pride in his work and would be using local labour
- ch) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) supported the application.
- (d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application subject to completing a 106 agreement in relation to the affordable property.
- dd) During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:
- That the objector's request for privacy through landscaping was reasonable and a material condition should be considered in order that this may be ensured
 - Would it be possible to consider more affordable houses? Higher percentage perhaps in a similar future situation?
- e. In response to an observation regarding privacy, the Planning Manager stated that it would be possible to create a Management Plan for the site and include a condition to ensure that vegetation be planted to safeguard the privacy of nearby residents.

RESOLVED to approve the application subject to the applicant's completion of a 106 Agreement in order to restrict the use of one of the houses to an affordable house for local need and subject to conditions involving:

1. Time
2. Compliance with plans

3. Materials including use of natural slate
4. Highways
5. Protecting trees
6. Welsh Water Note
7. Landscaping
8. Boundary treatment details
9. Removal of the affordable unit's PD rights
10. management plan during the construction phase (to include working hours/construction of a temporary boundary whilst building)

6. Application number C16/1686/46/LL Tŷ Isaf, Tudweiliog, Pwllheli

Extend an existing touring caravan site and site an additional 11 touring caravans, thus increasing the number from 15 to 26 and relocating three existing touring caravan pitches

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that it was an application to carry out improvements to an existing touring caravan site and to extend the site to the rest of the field, increasing the numbers of touring caravans on the site from 15 to 26. It was noted that the site was located on the outskirts of the development boundary of Tudweiliog village and within a Landscape Conservation Area.

It was highlighted that among the proposed improvements were proposals to construct an additional toilet / shower building along with landscaping work. An increase of 11 units would be a relatively large increase to the number of caravans. The site was not considered to be located in a conspicuous or obtrusive spot in the landscape, as it was fairly concealed from the county road that ran through the village of Tudweiliog.

Although three dwellings were located directly adjacent to the site's eastern boundary, it was not considered that the proposal would cause significant harm to the amenities of the local neighbourhood; it would, therefore, be acceptable with respect to Policy B23 of the GUDP. It was added that the proposal would not cause significant harm to the social, linguistic or cultural fabric of the community, and that it was acceptable in respect of Policy A2 of the GUDP.

In terms of ensuring that the site was properly managed, material conditions could be imposed.

- (b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:;
- That he was supportive of the application.
 - The site was well managed.
 - That good work had been done with the planting with more yet to come
 - That the residents of the village were supportive of the application and that it would bring economic benefit to the local community.

RESOLVED to approve the application

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with submitted plans.
3. The number of units on the site at any one time to be restricted to 26.
4. Restrict the season to between 1 March and 1 October.
5. Holiday use only.
6. A register to be kept.
7. No storing of touring caravans on the site.
8. Carry out the landscaping plan.

7. Application number C16/0005/44/LL - Land on Smith Street, Porthmadog

Application to erect a terrace of four houses

The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application for the construction of a terrace of four, two-storey houses with eight ancillary parking spaces to the front, and gardens to the rear. It was explained that the existing site was a parcel of open land but included single-storey garages on part of the site.

It was explained that a stone wall surrounded the site, whilst residential dwellings of varying sizes and appearance abutted the site with the development boundary of Porthmadog on previously developed land - the proposal therefore conformed to the requirements of policies C1, C3 and CH3. There were various workshops nearby and the High Street buildings backed onto the unclassified road that ran past the front of the site. It was noted that there was a wide entrance to the existing site, which was protected by a standard gate.

It was highlighted that the objections included traffic and parking matters and the impact on residential amenities.

Although the existing built up character of the area was fairly dense, which meant that such matters as proximity and overlooking were relatively common features, it was not considered that the development would lead to excessive over-looking or to an unacceptable impact on the amenities of nearby residents and the amenities of the area in general.

Concerns raised by local residents about the impact of the proposed development on matters involving movement, safety and the restrictive nature of the existing access road were highlighted. In addition to this, the buildings on the High Street backed onto the road and it was likely that vehicles would use this access road to deliver goods to these buildings.

The application was originally submitted with four parking bays to the front of the site for the four houses but following the Transportation Unit's dissatisfaction the plan was amended to show provision for eight vehicles.

- (a) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:
- Problems with parking and refuse collection already existed in the area; The member had sought to hold a discussion with the Transportation Unit
 - A recent accident with a refuse lorry had raised concerns

In response to observations, the Senior Development Control Officer – Transportation noted that the accident was independent of the application.

- (b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- (c) During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:
- A large enough area would need to be ensured for the storage of bins
 - That a clear pathway would need to be ensured to take the bins to the collection point
 - Suggestion to include a condition to ensure that this detail was included on the plan

RESOLVED to approve the application subject to including an additional condition to ensure sufficient space to store and move bins

1. Time
2. Compliance with plans
3. Materials
4. Highway conditions
5. Welsh Water
6. Boundary treatment details
7. Withdrawal of permitted development rights and PD rights - windows
8. an area for storing and moving bins for collection

8. Application number C17/0015/42/LL - Seaside Hut (Site 3), Lôn Penrallt, Nefyn

Relocation of a seaside hut

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received

- a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background to the application, noting that it was an application to relocate an existing beach hut from its position on a slope to a more even location on the bottom of the slope adjacent to the sea wall. It was highlighted that the applicant had asked to move the hut because of the landslides that occurred from time to time on the slope.

It was noted that the site was located in the countryside, within a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest and within a heritage landscape with the Llŷn AONB located 1.3 metres away to the west and east.

There were no objections to relocating the hut in another nearby location; however, it was not possible to see how relocating the hut to a site at the bottom of the slope could exasperate the situation caused by landslides. It would be a matter for the applicant to relocate the hut and its associated implications.

Having considered all the material planning matters including the local and national policies and guidances, it was believed that this application to relocate a seaside hut was acceptable and complied with the requirements of the relevant policies

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:
- That there were concerns and risks of landslides in the area
 - Relocating the hut would not protect it from landslides
 - Suggestion to ensure that the hut was set back 3.5m in order to ensure that fishermen were able to use the sea wall to access the harbour - a pathway existed there historically
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- ch) In response to a question regarding the Council's responsibility should a landslide occur and the hut be damaged, the Solicitor stated that the issue was with the relocation of a hut and that consideration was to be given to planning matters and principles. Acknowledgement was given to the fact that the cliff was dangerous, but that this was not the Committee's responsibility
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:
- Need to ensure that relocating one hut does not set a precedent
 - An application to register a historical pathway in order to secure legal protection

RESOLVED to approve the application

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with submitted plans.
3. Clearing the existing site of all materials.

9. Application number C17/0069/00/LL - Plot at Ffordd Bro Mynach, Abermaw/Barmouth

Erection of detached three-storey dwelling

- a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background to the application, noting that this was a full planning application to erect a detached, three-storey dwelling on a site located within a residential estate where the site was currently used as a domestic garden for Tŷ Mynach, which was owned by the applicant.

The proposal would involve erecting a three-bedroom dwelling with a double garage on the ground floor of the house, two parking spaces and turning place on the southern part of the site. A balcony would be provided on the southern elevation of the dwelling on the first floor. The intention would be to finish the external walls with render and a natural slate roof. It was explained that the houses in the area varied in size and scale and, whilst the dwelling was quite large, the plot was considered to be big enough to accommodate a dwelling of this size.

It was noted that the site was located within the development boundary of the village of Barmouth, and it was, therefore, considered that the principle of the proposal was acceptable in accordance with policies C1 and CH4 of the Unitary Development Plan. The exterior finish was considered to be acceptable and the proposal included conditions to submit landscaping details to be approved by the Council. It was highlighted that the site was located within the Ardudwy Landscape of Special Historic Interest; and, as the site was within the area/built form of the town of Barmouth it was not considered that there would be a significant impact on the wider landscape.

Concerns had been received that the development was oppressive and out of character with the other houses on the estate; nevertheless, because of the above reasons it was considered that there were no concerns to this end.

It was not considered that this development would cause direct and unacceptable overlooking; and it was considered that there would be no impact on the character of the listed buildings located approximately 60m away. No objection to the proposal was received from the Transportation Unit, on the condition of including material conditions and notes.

In response to the consultation, the Biodiversity Unit noted that there was no objection to the principle of the development as long as conditions were imposed on any permission noting the details of the external lighting for the dwelling, scheme to treat and dispose of invasive species on the site, and a plan to provide biodiversity improvements to include boxes for bats and birds.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:-
- That the development would have an effect on nearby amenities.
 - That the building was on three levels - this was oppressive
 - Concern about overlooking and loss of privacy - the overlooking was unreasonable
 - The scale, size and form of the development was oppressive and was not in keeping with the area
 - It would have an impact on adjacent buildings
 - Some registered buildings in the area; therefore, necessary to be in keeping with other local houses

- Render not in keeping with the local grey stone
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- That the site was located within the development plan
 - The building had been designed to ensure that the main site was on level one
 - That it would appear to be a two-storey house from public vantage points
 - That a number of objections had come from the same place
 - That he had responded to and discussed concerns with objectors

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

RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.

10. Application number C17/0094/40/AM - Land by Bodelen, Siop yr Efail, Efailnewydd

Outline application for the erection of an affordable house.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that it was an outline application for an affordable two-storey house within the gardens of two existing properties. It was noted that Policy CH4 was relevant and stated that, in principle, proposals for the construction of new dwellings on unallocated sites within village development boundaries would be approved provided they conformed to all the relevant policies of the Plan and the three criteria which form part of the Policy.

It was highlighted that Policy B23 of the GUDP considered the impact of the proposal on nearby residential amenities. Although no details had been submitted with the application to show the location of the first floor rooms and windows, it was stated that the house's location, its height, and the likelihood of installing windows to the northern elevation (rear) as part of the interior layout of the proposed house, gave rise to substantial concerns about the impact of the proposal on the privacy and amenities of the residents of the house to the rear and to the north of the site.

Grave concerns were expressed about the development. The proposal was considered to be an over-development of a small site and considered to be unacceptable in relation to Policy B23 as it would cause significant harm to the amenities of the local neighbourhood, it would be an over-development of a small site, and would reduce the amenity space of both existing houses through use of the garden as a plot for the proposed house. It was emphasised that the fact that it was the applicant who owned both nearby houses did not overcome the concerns relating to the over-development of a small site.

Attention was drawn to the fact that a previous application for the same development had been rejected under delegated rights on 18 January 2017 on the basis that:

"The dwelling, by virtue of its size and location would lead to an oppressive intrusion that would be harmful to the amenities of residents of neighbouring private property, especially because of its dominating effect and the overlooking that would result. The application was therefore contrary to Policies B23 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan and undermines policy PCYFF 1 LDP."

It was noted that the current proposal did not mitigate the substantial planning concerns related to the proposal and it was recommended that the application be rejected on the same grounds.

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

- That his family was one of the oldest families in Efailnewydd;
 - The house was meant to be built for his son;
 - That he understood that officers appreciated full details with regards to size, but that changing the size would be a minor issue on submission of a full planning application;
 - The Planning Service had received seven letters in support of the application;
 - That the Community Council was supportive;
 - That the proposal was acceptable from a road safety standpoint.
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:-
- The proposal would mean improving the existing entrance;
 - The proposal would increase parking spaces, providing spaces for four cars; thus satisfying the requirements under Policy CH35 of the GUDP for off road parking spaces;
 - The proposal was in accordance with Policy C1 of the GUDP as it was within the village development boundary;
 - That a new housing estate had been developed in the vicinity and that this had already led to a loss of privacy;
 - That there were no objections from the community or from the owners of the nearby house;
 - That the applicant was willing to cooperate with Welsh Water;
 - That it was important to support local people and allow developments that could enable young people to stay in the area;
 - The applicant's wish that the vote be recorded.

The Chair noted that it was a matter for the Committee to determine whether a recorded vote should be held.

In response to the applicant's observations and those of the local member, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the recommendation to refuse the application was robust and that the Committee should consider a site visit before deciding on the application because of matters relating to amenities.

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

RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.

The meeting commenced at 1:00pm and concluded at 4:20pm.

CHAIR