
PLANNING COMMITTEE 24/4/17

Present: Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones - Chair

Councillors: Simon Glyn, Gwen Griffith, Dyfrig Wynn Jones, Eric M. Jones, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen, W. Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams, John Wyn Williams ac Owain Williams (substitute).

Others invited: Councillors Anwen J. Davies, Dylan Fernley, Sian Wyn Hughes, Nigel W. Jones and W. Gareth Roberts (Local members).

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

Apologies: Councillors Endaf Cooke and Elwyn Edwards along with Councillor Brian Jones (Local Member).

1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

(a) Councillor Hefin Williams declared a personal interest in relation to item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0094/40/AM) because of business links.

The following members declared a personal interest in items 5.6 and 5.7 on the agenda, (planning application numbers C17/0100/46/LL and C17/0112/42/LL) for the reasons noted:

- Councillor Dyfrig Wynn Jones because his wife's family kept a caravan park in Llangwnadl;
- Councillor Gruffydd Williams because his father owned a caravan park located less than six miles from the site;
- Councillor Owain Williams because he owned a caravan park located less than six miles from the site.

The members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests and they left the Chamber during the discussion on the applications noted above.

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

- Councillor Anwen J. Davies (not a member of this Planning Committee), in items 5.1, 5.3 and 5.10 on the agenda (planning application numbers C17/0094/40/AM, C17/0016/33/LL and C17/0156/33/LL);
- Councillor W. Gareth Roberts, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/1373/30/LL);
- Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0041/09/LL);
- Councillors Dylan Fernley and Nigel W. Pickavance (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.5 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0084/11/LL);
- Councillor Simon Glyn (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.6 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0100/46/LL);
- Councillor Sian Wyn Hughes (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.7 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0112/42/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 3 April 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. Planning application number C17/0094/40/AM - Land by Bodelen, Siop yr Efail, Efailnewydd

Outline application for the erection of an affordable house.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 3 April 2017 in order to hold a site visit. Some members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

Attention was drawn to the fact that a letter had been received from the owner of an adjacent house expressing strong concern about the impact of the proposal on an adjacent property since publishing the agenda.

Substantial concern was expressed regarding the development, it was considered that the proposal was an over-development of the narrow site and it was not considered that the proposal was acceptable in respect of Policy B23 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan (GUDP), because it would cause significant harm to the amenities of the local neighbourhood, would be an over-development of a narrow site and would reduce the amenity space of the two existing houses by using the garden as a plot for the proposed house. It was emphasised that that the applicant owned two of the nearby houses did not overcome the concerns relating to the over-development of a small site.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the previous application for the same development had been refused under delegated rights. It was noted that the current proposal did not mitigate substantial planning concerns regarding the proposal and it was recommended to refuse the application.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:-
- That the site was within the development boundary of the village;
 - The development would enable a local young person to remain in their home area;
 - That the neighbours were in favour of the development;
 - That planning applications for housing in gardens of a similar size had been approved;
 - That the applicant was prepared to discuss the size and height of the house with the Planning Service.

In response to the local member's observations, the Planning Manager explained that although it was an outline application, the applicant had to note a maximum and minimum in

terms of measurements and it was not possible to negotiate the measurements after outline permission was granted.

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

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

- That the proposal would lead to an oppressive and harmful intrusion to the amenities of the residents of nearby private properties.
- Only one individual had objected to the proposal;
- The proposal should be welcomed, housing was needed for local people with young people leaving the area;
- That the applicant was prepared to discuss the size and height of the house with the Planning Service. The application should be approved and then a discussion held.

- (ch) An amendment was proposed to defer the application in order to hold a further discussion with the applicant in terms of the size and height of the house.

The Planning Manager noted that reducing the size of the house would not overcome the concerns in relation to over-development, because as a result of reducing the size, it was likely that the height of the house would have to increase thus making the house more oppressive.

The amendment was seconded.

The Senior Planning Service Manager emphasised that although the site was within the development boundary, the location restricted what could be developed on the site. It was noted that reducing the size would not overcome the refusal reasons.

A member noted that although she sympathised with the Local Member, she could not support the application as it would be an over-development and there would be more of a parking area than a recreational area on the site. It had to be kept in mind that the development would be on the site forever, not just in order to respond to the needs of the current owner.

A vote was taken on the amendment to defer, and the amendment fell.

- (d) In response to a member's observation, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that minor amendments would not overcome concerns.

A member noted that the site was too small for a reasonably sized house, and although she wanted to support local people, they deserved a quality house. She added that the proposal would be harmful to the living standards of the neighbours and the applicant.

- (dd) In accordance with the Procedural Rules, the following vote to **refuse the application** was recorded:

In favour of the proposal to refuse the application (6): Councillors Gwen Griffith, Anne Lloyd Jones, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen, W. Tudor Owen and John Wyn Williams.

Against the proposal to refuse the application (5): Councillors Simon Glyn, Eric M. Jones, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams and Owain Williams.

Abstaining, (0)

RESOLVED to refuse the application.

Reason:

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 is therefore contrary to Policies B23 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan and undermines policy PCYFF 1 LDP.

2. Planning application C16/1373/30/LL - Land between Y Ddôl and Penllech Bach, Lôn Deunant, Aberdaron

Residential development of five affordable dwellings along with a new vehicular access and estate road.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the site in its entirety was located outside but immediately adjacent to the development boundary of the village of Aberdaron. It was noted that policy C1 of the GUDP stated that proposals for affordable housing would be approved on suitable rural sites immediately on the boundaries of villages and local centres as an exception to normal housing policies provided that all criteria included in the policy could be complied with.

It was explained that the proposal complied with the criteria under this policy because:

- The information submitted in the Affordable Housing Statement and the response of the Housing Strategic Unit confirmed that there was a need in the area for affordable housing;
- That the site formed a reasonable extension to the built form of this part of the village of Aberdaron and that it would not form an unacceptable extension to the countryside;
- That the occupancy of the house would be restricted as affordable housing by means of a 106 affordable housing agreement for general local need.

It was confirmed that the houses corresponded to the requirements of the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Affordable Housing in terms of size. It was reported that information had been received about the open market price of the houses with the valuation noting that the price of the houses would be between £230,000 and £250,000 on the open market. Considering the valuations received and the observations of the Housing Strategic Unit, it was considered that the discount off the value of the open market price of the house should be at least 40%.

It was noted that the Transportation Unit was satisfied with the proposal provided that the application would be approved with conditions relating to the access and parking.

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

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), supported the application, and he noted that it was a reasonable extension to the village and that local young people should be supported in their attempt to obtain a home.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

A member noted that he welcomed the application but that he was concerned about the affordability of the houses, it was not obvious that the Housing Strategic Unit was completely satisfied with the proposal. He was surprised as there was no mix of houses and was of the opinion that an opportunity needed to be given to young people who needed a two or four bedroom house.

In response, the Planning Manager noted that the Affordable Housing Statement noted that the houses met the needs of five specific families.

A member noted that he had been completely convinced that there was a local need and that the proposal addressed the needs of young couples who wished to live locally.

RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Planning Service Manager to approve the application subject to the applicant completing a 106 agreement binding the houses as general need affordable housing.

Conditions:

1. Time
2. Compliance with plans
3. Slates on the roof
4. Agree on materials for the external elevations.
5. Removal of permitted development rights
6. Ensure that the garage / shed / balcony will only be used for those purposes and that they will not be changed to form a part of the interior rooms of the house.
7. Highways
8. Drainage plan
9. Agree on the exact details of the cloddiau

Notes

1. Welsh Water.
2. Highways.

3. Application number C17/0016/33/LL – Tŷ Cynan, Rhydyclafdy, Pwllheli

Creation of touring caravan site for 10 units including a toilet / shower block, hard standings and a septic tank.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application site was located outside the development boundary of the village and over 60 metres away from the nearest residential houses. It was noted that the proposal was not considered to be one that would cause significant harm to the amenities of the local neighbourhood.

Attention was drawn to the fact that a letter had been received objecting to the proposal since the agenda had been published.

The original proposal had included a proposal to connect the toilet's drains to a new septic tank. However, an amended plan had been received from the applicant showing a proposal to connect the toilets to the public sewer running through the site. It was noted that the recommendation had been amended; now it was recommended to delegate powers to the Planning Manager to approve the application subject to reaching agreement on the exact method of disposing of sewage.

It was noted that due to the scale and location of the application together with the existing natural features it was not considered that the site was obtrusive in the landscape, nor was it considered that it was likely to have a significant harmful impact on the visual amenities of the Landscape Conservation Area.

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

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

- That a vast number of trees had been planted on the site to improve screening;
- That reducing the height of the hedge would improve visibility from the entrance;
- That the proposal would provide an additional income to protect his family's home;
- The proposal had been designed carefully in order to reduce the impact on the community;
- That there was local support to the proposal.

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

A member noted that despite the fact that there was attention in the press in relation to his views on touring caravan parks, he was not against the application and the applicant had striven to conceal the site.

RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application subject to reaching agreement on the exact method of sewage disposal.

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. In accordance with submitted plans.
3. The number of units on the site at any one time to be restricted to 10.
4. Conditions on the timeframe for siting caravans/holiday period/moving the caravans when not in use
5. No storing on the land
6. Records list
7. Landscaping
8. Improve access visibility before using the site.
9. Submit *clawdd* construction details along the site's northern and eastern boundary and implement it before using the site.

4. Application number C17/0041/09/LL – Land adjacent to Glan y Môr, Tywyn

The discussion on this item was chaired by Councillor Michael Sol Owen.

Erection of two terraces of nine dwellings (four dwellings to be for affordable local need).

(a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the proposal was a residential development on a site within the development boundary of Tywyn town with some residential houses located on land adjacent to the site in every direction.

It was noted that there would be a reduction of 20% in the price of the affordable housing to approximately £128,000 in comparison to an open market price of approximately £160,000.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the application site was located within a flood zone but that there was concern that the access to the site from Marine Parade could be affected by flooding. It had been noted originally that Natural Resources Wales (NRW) had substantial concerns; however, following amendments to the contents of the Flood Consequence Assessment, confirmation had been received that NRW was happy with the amendments provided that conditions were imposed on any planning permission noting that the escape route to the direction of Ffordd Warwig (to the east) would be provided before the development was occupied, and that the finished floor level of the development was 7.1 metres Above Ordnance Datum.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

(b) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) noted that she was satisfied with the recommendations.

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

In response to a member's observation that the affordable housing was high considering salaries in the Meirionnydd area, the Planning Manager noted that the Housing Strategic Unit had confirmed that they were affordable.

RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to the applicant completing a legal agreement under Section 106 of the Planning Act 1990 in order to ensure that four out of a total of nine houses are affordable initially and in perpetuity.

Conditions:

1. Five years to commence the work.
2. In accordance with the submitted plans.
3. Natural slate.
4. External materials to be agreed
5. Landscaping work, planting and improvements to biodiversity to be completed within a specific time-schedule
6. Relevant highway conditions.
7. Removal of permitted development rights.
8. The finished floor levels of the dwellings to be 7.1 metres Above Ordnance Datum.
9. Ensure that a footpath is provided to link the site with Warwick Place and available prior to the occupation of the houses, the path should be kept clear and unobstructed during the development's lifetime.
10. A condition to submit and agree upon site boundary details.
11. No surface water is to be disposed of into the public sewer.
12. Not to disturb Welsh Water resources crossing or nearby the application site.

5. Application number C17/0084/11/LL - Maesgeirchen Social Club, 90, Penrhyn Avenue, Bangor

Demolition of existing social club building and erection of a three-storey building with shop (including café, fascia signage and ATM) on ground floor and 10 single bedroom flats on the floors above together with two storage containers (re-submission of application C16/0157/11/LL)

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site was located within the development boundary of the Sub-regional Centre of Bangor. It was noted that policy CH38 of the GUDP involved safeguarding existing community facilities. Whilst accepting that a community facility had been lost from this site due to problems with the viability of the previous business, the new building would be a community facility in itself, and by providing a broader range of services, there was potential to ensure a more certain future for the site.

It was explained that the policies of the Unitary Development Plan were supportive of the principle of seeking to ensure positive developments on re-development sites such as this one which was within urban development boundaries.

It was noted that the proposed building would be substantially higher than the existing building, and indeed it would be higher than all of the other buildings in the vicinity. Attention was drawn to the fact that there were many three-storey buildings in other parts of Maesgeirchen, including blocks of flats of similar size, and it was not considered that a building such as this would be different in nature to other buildings in on the estate.

Although local concerns about the proposal were appreciated, it was noted that the plan had to be considered in the context of the site's urban location as well as its previous use. It

was not believed that the development would have an additional significant detrimental effect on the amenities of neighbouring residents and the development would therefore be in-keeping with Policies B23 and B33 of the GUDP which aimed to protect the amenities of local residents.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the Housing Market Assessment submitted with the application alleged that there was a lack of one-bedroom units for individuals or couples who wished to take their first step on the property ladder in the local housing market. It was noted that the site in general was suitable for living units and these flats would meet with the local demand in an affordable way.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- That there was a need for accommodation and a shop in Maesgeirchen;
 - That there was demand for one-bedroom accommodation which was not being met;
 - That he had experience of developing such properties.
- (c) Councillor Nigel Pickavance, local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and he made the following main points:-
- That there was a high number of objections to the proposal;
 - That it would be an over-development of the site;
 - That there were anti-social problems in a block of flats located 4 miles from the site and considering that this site would not be managed, he was concerned that similar problems would arise;
 - His concern that the building would overlook two playing fields;
 - Suggested that a site visit should be undertaken;
 - That there was no need for a shop and café in the area as these needs were being met by the current provision in Maesgeirchen.

Councillor Dylan Fernley, local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), made the following main points:-

- Essential that a site visit was undertaken to assess the situation;
- That the development would have a harmful impact on similar local businesses;
- His concerns in terms of the increase in anti-social problems as a result of the development;
- The development would not be in keeping with the area due to its height and the accommodation would not be suitable for the disabled;
- That there was a need for accommodation in the area but it had to be suitable and managed.

- (ch) A proposal to undertake a site visit was made. The member noted that a site visit should be held due to the concerns of the Local Members and her concern that the building would stand out due to the height of the site.

The proposal was seconded.

RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.

6. Application number C17/0100/46/LL – Hirdre Ganol, Edern, Pwllheli

Extend existing touring caravan site and increase the number of touring caravans from 11 to 22.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the application site was located in the countryside and within the Landscape Conservation Area. Although the site or parts of the site were visible from higher areas further away, it was not considered that the proposal of extending the site in terms of its surface area and numbers was likely to cause an obtrusive and prominent feature in the landscape.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the site was located approximately 225 metres from the Llŷn Fens Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Cors Hirdre Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It was noted that observations had been received from Natural Resources Wales about the proposal and these observations considered that the development, because of its nature, was unlikely to effect the features, ecological integrity or the practicality of any statutory sites of ecological, geological and/or geomorphological interest.

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

- (b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) supported the application and noted that the site was suitable for the number requested and that the caravan site was being managed responsibly.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with submitted plans.
3. The number of touring units on the site at any one time to be restricted to 22.
4. Restrict the season to between 1 March and 31 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 C17/0112/42/LL – Gwynant, Lôn Cae Glas, Edern, Pwllheli

Increase number of touring caravans from 25 to 35 along with environmental improvements.

- (a) The Development Control Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that the site was located approximately 350 metres outside the development boundary of Edern and within a Landscape Conservation Area.

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

It was noted that due to the scale and location of the application together with the existing natural features it was not considered that the site was obtrusive in the landscape, nor was it considered that it was likely to have a significant harmful impact on the visual amenities of the Landscape Conservation Area.

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

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), supported the application and she made the following main points:-
- That the applicant made a living from the caravan park;
 - That they had a stable customer base and a waiting list for plots;

- That the site was not visible;
- That the Transportation Unit did not object to increasing the number; there were a number of passing places along the road.

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

A member noted that he did not object to the proposal but that he was concerned about the cumulative impact on the area.

A member noted that it was essential to attract tourists to the area. A member added that the proposal would increase local income.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with submitted plans.
3. The number of touring units on the site at any one time to be restricted to 35.
4. Restrict the season to between 1 March and 31 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.

8. Application number C17/0116/08/LL – Workshops, Portmeirion, Penrhyndeudraeth

Full application to erect a new services building to include stores, workshops, laundry room and offices as well as planting a new woodland on adjacent land.

(a) The Development Control Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that the site was within the boundary of the Conservation Area and within an area designated as a Landscape Conservation Area.

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

It was acknowledged that it was a substantially sized building of an 'industrial' appearance within a sensitive area with regard to designations and appearance. Nevertheless, it was believed that the proposal would be an opportunity to neaten the site. It was noted that the final exterior elevations were to be agreed by means of a formal condition. It was not believed that the building due to its size, design and finish would impact upon the features or character of the protected areas.

It was noted that the proposed development involves felling some existing trees within the site, observations received from the Biodiversity Unit stated that any felling should take place outside the bird nesting season, and when the site was completed it should not be lit to any extent that would affect an ancient woodland. It was suggested that relevant conditions should be included to ensure that the above requirements were satisfied.

It was reported that discussions had been held between the Biodiversity Unit's Senior Officer and the applicant to agree on appropriate mitigation measures for the loss of trees on the site. It was noted that the applicant had proposed to plant a woodland of indigenous species on nearby land and further landscaping details would be provided in order to agree upon other areas for tree planting.

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

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:-
- That he had submitted photographs to the Planning Service;
 - That he was the owner of quality self-catering accommodation with the garden looking directly towards the biomass building;
 - That he did not object to the proposal in principle but local and national policies also supported accommodation;
 - The need for the applicant to submit a detailed tree planting plan;
 - The need to undertake a visual impact assessment.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:-
- That the development was key to the sustainability of Portmeirion;
 - That the proposal would improve the resources;
 - Prepared to collaborate with the officers.
- (ch) In response to the objector's observations, the Planning Manager noted:
- That the Service had received photographs from him which showed the relationship between his property and the site. It was not considered that the impact would be unacceptable.
 - That a Senior Officer from the Biodiversity Unit had been holding discussions with the applicant and imposing a landscape condition was recommended.
 - Of the opinion that a visual impact assessment was not required as the site was relatively concealed within the Portmeirion site and it was not considered that a substantial harmful visual impact would derive from the proposal.
- (d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

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

- That the applicant was an important employer in the area which employed local people;
- That the resources were needed;
- That the landscaping was strong already;
- The need to consider the impact on the objector when the landscaping would be discussed.

The Planning Manager noted that the proposed landscaping/planting would exceed what was required to screen the development.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Time
2. Compliance with plans
3. Agree on finishes
4. Landscaping
5. Lighting Plan
6. Protect the public footpath
7. Welsh Water
8. Restrict use
9. Disposal of existing materials/equipment
10. No external storage of materials
11. Hours to be restricted

9. Application number C17/0144/23/LL – Land behind 1 Tai Trefor, Ceunant, Llanrug

Erection of agricultural shed.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the objections received mainly referred to the site's existing use, the size and location of the shed in relation to nearby property, and the impact of transport generated by the user on the condition of the private road leading to the site as well as the rear of the nearby terrace of houses.

It was noted that the shed's design was simple and of the type expected for an agricultural shed and that this type of building was a normal feature seen in a rural area; therefore, it was not considered that the shed would stand out prominently in the broader landscape. It was acknowledged that the shed would be entirely visible from the rear of the nearby houses and the gardens, but because the gable end of the shed would face the houses, and because of the distance between them, the impact was not deemed to be oppressive or substantially detrimental to the residential amenities.

It was highlighted that the land's use as part of an agricultural unit existed already. It was acknowledged that agricultural activities were likely to generate impacts but this impact already existed whether a shed existed on the site or not. It was reported that during a site visit, it had been clear that the unit did not have a suitable place to store machinery and equipment and this, in itself, created a negative visual impact. It was considered that approving a suitable storage shed to be constructed on the site would be a means of improving the site by keeping the equipment inside the shed. It was not considered that the shed would increase the impact on nearby residents as the shed would not lead to an increase in agricultural use of the site. The shed responded to existing use and needs.

Concerns raised by objectors about the housing of livestock in the shed were acknowledged, but this proposal was for a shed to store equipment, machinery and feed only.

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

It was noted that the development was suitable and acceptable for the site and that it complied with the local and national policies and guidelines noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- That the applicant did not have a farmhouse or ancillary buildings to store equipment. That this restricted the applicant's ability to develop the farm;
 - That the applicant acknowledged the concerns of the objectors but that the proposal would be an improvement as it would neaten the site;
 - The applicant's intention to improve the access track.

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

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

- Questioned the need to impose a condition to prevent the storage of manure and slurry within the building considering that storing these outside breached agricultural policies.
- That it should be considered not to impose the condition;
- That a section of the track was in the applicant's ownership with a section of it serving seven houses and that it was important that it was looked after.

In response to the above observations, the officers noted:

- That it was recommended to impose a condition to prevent the storage of manure and slurry within the building in order to overcome local concerns. The application did not request the storage of such materials and due to the proximity to the houses, it was considered that it would not be suitable to store it on the site;
- That the applicant could apply to amend or remove the condition;
- That any issue relating to the access track was a private matter to be dealt with outside the planning system.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Time
2. In accordance with the plans
3. Materials / finishes
4. Agricultural storage use only.
5. No storing of manure or slurry within the building.
6. Protect the water course.

10. Application number C17/0156/33/LL - Land near Bryn Hyfryd, Rhydyclafdy, Pwllheli

Construction of a portal frame building to relocate a vehicle repairs business and improvements to the access, exterior hard-standing, drainage and landscaping

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that policy D7 of the GUDP stated that proposals would be approved for small scale workshops/industrial units/business units if it can be shown that the development site was the most suitable location to supply the need and provided that the criteria in the policy were complied with. It was noted that the development in terms of its size was considered as a small-scale development. It was also requested that the site was justified as the most suitable to meet the need. It was reported that the applicant had submitted information on a number of sites that he has considered and that were unsuitable or unavailable for various reasons. From the information submitted, it appeared that an effort had been made to seek an alternative site, including sites on or near existing industrial sites, and no suitable alternative site was available.

It was explained that the proposal complied with the criteria under this policy because:

- The site was located exactly adjacent to the development boundary of the village. Although there would be some distance between the nearest building towards the east, it was considered that the proposal would be located comparatively close to the buildings in the village and when the houses with extant planning permission on the southern side of the county road would be constructed, the proposal would appear as if it was located within a group of buildings.
- That the scale of the proposal was acceptable for the site;
- That the proposed landscaping would compensate against the loss of the existing *clawdd* in order to create a suitable access. As part of the landscaping details, it would also be possible to request a long-term landscaping management plan;
- It was not considered that the proposal would cause significant harm to the local neighbourhood in terms of its scale, type and design.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the site lies within the Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. In terms of its location and its size, it was considered that its impact would be local and it would not have a wider impact on the historic landscape.

It was noted that the development was suitable and acceptable for the site and that it complied with the local and national policies and guidelines noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- That the survey of potential sites for the relocation of the business highlighted the lack of suitable sites, except for the site in question;
 - Extending the village's 30mph speed restriction beyond the site would improve road safety;
 - The proposal would safeguard a business that employed three full-time and four part-time members of staff;
 - The proposal would safeguard an important service in the countryside;
 - That the proposal complied with the policies of the GUDP;
 - That there was no objection to the proposal and that 80 letters of support had been received from the local neighbourhood.
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:-
- That there was a need for employment in the countryside;
 - That the Community Council, the Transportation Unit, Natural Resources Wales and the community were in favour of the application;
 - It had been a trying time for the businesses but she hoped that the application would be supported.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

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

- That the location was excellent and that the development would benefit the local economy;
- Questioned the opening times recommended. It would be unfair to prevent the business from competing by restricting the hours, therefore, the opening hours should be changed to between 8am and 6pm and to also include Saturday morning opening in order to be the same as similar businesses;
- Glad that the Council had collaborated with the applicant to find a solution and expressed gratitude to the applicant and officers.

In response to the above-mentioned observations, the Planning Manager noted that the applicant himself had proposed the opening hours.

RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application with conditions, subject to holding discussions with the applicant in terms of working hours.

Conditions:

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with plans.
3. The building to be of a green colour BS 12 C 39.
4. Submit and agree upon a plan for the erection of the clawdd and landscaping as well as submit a long-term landscaping management plan.
5. Implement the landscaping plan.
6. *Cloddiau* to be erected prior to the commencement of use.
7. Working hours.
8. Highways conditions
9. Suitable bunds to be built for the tanks.

10. Welsh Water Condition.
11. Lighting plan to be agreed and no other exterior lights to be installed without written permission from the Local Planning Authority.
12. No vehicles to be repaired outside the building.

11. Application number C17/0182/03/LL – Tŷ'n y Coed, The Old Quarry Hospital, Rhiwbryfdir, Blaenau Ffestiniog

A retrospective application to change the land use to create a touring caravan site and to extend the existing building to create toilets and to erect a building to dispose of waste.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site was located within the development boundary of Blaenau Ffestiniog. The site was empty land behind Gwynedd Terrace, and there were a number of houses dispersed around the site.

It was reported that work had already commenced on the site and the majority of the formal pitches were in place, and the vegetation had been planted. During the site visits, a touring caravan and a motor-home were located on the site. The applicant was aware of the planning situation, and the Enforcement Unit had already been discussing the matter with him.

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

It was noted that the Caravans Officers had confirmed that the site setting did not meet the licensing conditions (Model Standards 1983) in terms of site density. It was considered that the layout of the site was not suitable for its proposed use as a touring site. Attention was drawn to the fact that no open spaces had been planned into the site, and although there were open spaces immediately nearby, there was no space for children to play within the safety of the site itself.

It was noted that the site was located off Ffordd Baltic (unclassified road) and that the access to this road was approximately 80m away from the junction of Ffordd Baltic with the A470 trunk road. This was the most direct route into and out of the site. A new access had already been created to this site from Ffordd Baltic. There was no specific objection to this access alone. The Transport Unit had confirmed that the road network from this access to the right towards the A470 or to the left towards Glanypwll Road was of sufficient width to cope with general two-way traffic, but it was not considered that the junction on either side of Ffordd Baltic (i.e. junction with the A470 or the junction with Glanypwll Road) was suitable for the type of expected traffic in relation to a touring caravan site. In addition, the Trunk Road Unit had confirmed that the use of the Ffordd Baltic junction to the A470 would be unacceptable.

It was reported that the Enforcement Case Officer and the Transport Unit had stated clearly that the site access off Ffordd Baltic was unacceptable should an application be submitted for the site. They had already suggested that possibly the use of the existing access past the applicant's property known as Tŷ'n y Coed could be acceptable. This access did not form a part of the application, and it had not been assessed by the Trunk Road Unit.

It was noted that the development was considered unsuitable for the site and that it was contrary to the relevant policies as noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:
- That he owned three businesses and employed local people;

- That he had met a Senior Development Control Officer on 3/3/14 where the possibility of having such a development on the site had been discussed. The officer had noted that he could not envisage a problem that could not be overcome;
- That the officer had spoken with the Senior Development Control Officer - Transportation, and that he had received confirmation over the phone on 10/3/14 that the proposed access was fine;
- The junction near Baltic House would not be used, the next junction that had just been redone would be used. He had contacted an officer from the Trunk Road Authority and he had received confirmation that they were happy with the proposal provided that signage was erected showing that Ffordd Baltic should not be used.
- That he had commenced work on the site and that he intended to carry out the work in his own time.

(c) In response to the above observations, the Senior Development Control Officer - Transportation noted:-

- That he had received an enquiry from a Senior Development Control Officer regarding the site and had visited the site in relation to developing the site for motor-homes;
- That an access from Hospital Road had been discussed and that he had e-mails that had been sent to the Planning Service to confirm this. Access from Ffordd Baltic had not been discussed.

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 3.50pm.

CHAIR