

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 26/02/18

---

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

**Councillors:** Stephen Churchman, Simon Glyn, Louise Hughes, Sian Wyn Hughes (p.m), Eric M. Jones, Huw G. Wyn Jones, Edgar Wyn Owen, Catrin Wager, Eirwyn Williams, Owain Williams and Gruffydd Williams.

**Others invited:** Councillor Menna Baines, E. Selwyn Griffiths, Elwyn Jones, Dafydd Owen and Dewi Wyn Roberts (Local Members).

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Planning Manager), Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Gwyn Lloyd Evans (Enforcement Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Officer - Transport), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor), Glynda O'Brien and Bethan Adams (Member Support Officers).

**Apologies:** Councillors Sian Wyn Hughes (a.m.), Berwyn Parry Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd along with Councillors Elin Walker Jones and John Brynmor Hughes (Local Members).

### 1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

(a) The following members declared a personal interest in the following items for the reasons noted:

- Councillor Eirwyn Williams in item 5.1 on the agenda (C16/0564/35/LL), as his daughter lived in Arvonja Gardens.
- Councillor Stephen Churchman in items 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 on the agenda (planning application numbers C16/0564/35/LL, C17/1118/11/LL and C17/1269/25/LL), as he was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd, and also in item 5.10 (planning application number C17/1094/36/LL), as he was the applicant's neighbour and friend.
- Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones in items 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 on the agenda (planning application numbers C16/0564/35/LL, C17/1118/11/LL and C17/1269/25/LL), as she was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.
- Councillor Gruffydd Williams in item 5.12 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1175/42/LL), as his father owned a Caravan Park located less than six miles from the site of this application.
- Councillor Owain Williams in item 5.12 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/1175/42/LL), as he was the owner of a Caravan Park located less than six miles from the site of this application.

Members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and they withdrew from the Chamber during the discussions on the items noted.

(b) The Planning Manager declared a personal interest in item 5.3 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1269/25/LL) as her aunt lived near the site (adjoined the site) and had objected to the application.

The officer was of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest and she left the Chamber during the discussion on the applications.

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

- Councillor Menna Baines (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.2 and 5.3 on the agenda, (planning application numbers C17/1118/11/LL and C17/1269/25/LL);
- Councillor Elwyn Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.5 and 5.14 on the agenda, (planning application numbers C17/0846/18/LL and C17/1211/18/LL);
- Councillor Dewi Wyn Roberts (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.9, 5.11 and 5.16 on the agenda (planning application numbers C17/1056/39/LL, C17/1161/39/LL and C17/1225/39/LL);
- Councillor Sian Wyn Hughes, (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.12 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1175/42/LL);
- Councillor E. Selwyn Griffiths (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.15 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1218/44/LL);
- Councillor Dafydd Owen (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.17 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1266/16/LL)

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

- (ch) Members noted that they had been lobbied by an individual in relation to item 5.17 (planning application number C17/1266/16/LL) on the agenda.

## 2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this Committee, that took place on 5 February 2018, 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 policy aspects.

### RESOLVED

#### 1. Application number C16/0564/35/LL – Vacant Land, Waun Helyg, Cricieth

**The Vice-chair chaired the committee for the application above as the Chair had declared a personal interest and had left the Chamber.**

Application to erect 10 affordable units.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that it had been submitted by Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd on land that was in its ownership, located within the Cricieth development boundary and it had been designated as a play area. The decision on this application had been deferred at the Planning Committee meeting on 27 November 2017 because there had been no quorum and since then it was noted that the application had been amended to provide a pavement and a crossing on the B4411 and an open space within the site. Reference was made to the late observations form which noted that the Town Council did not object to the application. It was noted that the principle of the development was acceptable and complied with relevant policies as the site plan had been revised to provide a 261 square metre open space/play area within the site. The open space would be used and would offer better benefits to the community than the vacant land which currently existed. It was noted that the Transportation Unit was supportive of the proposal and that the original concerns of Natural Resources Wales regarding flooding had been

resolved by means of relevant conditions. The planning officers' recommendation was to approve the application with suitable conditions along with a permitted development condition and an affordable housing condition.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:
- the proposed development was located on land designated as open space but it was emphasised that the land was dormant and had overgrown for over 15 years.
  - the landscape was poor and a substantial amount of money needed to be spent to re-develop it as a playing field and financial sources for this type of provision were unavailable and that there was no intention to create a play area on the land.
  - however, it was noted that there was an opportunity to develop the site for affordable housing by means of the Welsh Government's social housing grant.
  - following consultation with the Planning Department, the provision of a play area was indicated on the plans and attention was drawn to the fact that there was a play area approximately 500 metres from the proposed site and it was committed to provide a crossing for children to be able to cross the road which would benefit new tenants and also the residents and children of Waun Helyg estate.
  - Over 130 individuals had registered on the waiting list of the Gwynedd Housing Options Team which included affordable housing with 2/3 bedrooms in Cricieth.
  - the application would be a way of developing modern and sustainable housing and address the local need.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- (ch) A Member noted that while he was supportive of the application in principle, he was not satisfied with the play facilities and the importance of children being able to play safely in their areas was emphasised. He was under the impression that any development had to promote safe playing areas and it was asked how much funding was provided by the developer to improve play facilities as a result of depriving the area of this open space / play area.

In response, the Planning Manager referred to paragraph 5.7 of the report and added that there was no intention to request a financial contribution as the developer intended to provide 261 square metres of open space on the site which was sufficient and the fact that there was an intention to improve the footpath with the play provision located over the highway to the site.

**RESOLVED to approve subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Five years**
- 2. Complete in accordance with the plans**
- 3. Slate**
- 4. Finish**
- 5. Highways Conditions**
- 6. Condition to ensure the pavement and crossing are completed prior to occupation of the houses**
- 7. Conditions relating to the finished floor level**
- 8. Bat mitigation measures**
- 9. Landscaping and boundary details**
- 10. Agree on a scheme to protect reptiles**
- 11. Agree on trees to be disposed of in advance**
- 12. Eradicate Japanese knotweed**
- 13. Drainage plan**
- 14. Permitted development condition**
- 15. Affordable housing condition**

## 2. Application number C12/1118/11/LL – 4-5 Trem Elidir, Bangor

**The Vice-chair chaired the committee for the application above as the Chair had declared a personal interest and had left the Chamber.**

Demolition of existing building and erection of new two-storey building to provide eight flats and parking spaces.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the proposal involved demolishing a shop and two existing flats and erecting a new two-storey building in its place for flats and creation of parking provision. The site was located within the development boundary of Bangor and had not been allocated or protected for any use in the Local Development Plan. Reference was made to the relevant policies and public consultations within the report. It was noted that Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd was the applicant and that all units were being offered as affordable dwellings to be socially rented, and the application included an Affordable Housing Statement. There was clear evidence that there was a need for such flats for individuals and families on social rent in the ward, and the Council's Strategic Unit noted that information in terms of need was consistent with need in the area. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable in respect of design and appearance. It could be seen from paragraphs 5.8 to 5.14 of the report that there was no objection to the matters noted in those sections. The planning officers' recommendation was that the proposal was acceptable to be approved with relevant conditions.

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

- Historically, the old shops in Trem Elidir had been difficult to let and had now been empty for some time.
- The flats were very small and not of suitable standard.
- It was proposed to demolish them and construct new flats with the intention of letting them for social rent and not for students or different units.
- Housing needs were high for one and two bedroom units across Bangor wards with over 800 on the waiting list for a one bedroom unit and over 1000 for 2 bedroom units, and therefore, it was clear that there would be a number of applications for the eight proposed flats.
- Prospective tenants would be selected from the waiting list administered by Gwynedd Council's Housing Options Team which was a register based on a points system and awarded additional points for individuals with local connections.
- Gwynedd Council's Strategic Housing Unit was supportive of the proposal.
- An appeal was made for the Planning Committee to approve the application.

- (c) A Member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee), who was acting on behalf of the Local Member, noted the following main points:

- She was supportive of the planning application.
- According to the plans, the ground floor flats were accessible and suitable for older people, people with disabilities and wheelchair users, and had parking spaces as part of the plan.
- Closing the shop had been a loss for the community and the building had become dilapidated over the past few years, attracting a lot of offenders, fly-tipping, etc.
- The only option was to develop it as a residential site.
- As there was already a building on the land, the land was designated as a brownfield site and suitable for construction.
- The community of Maes Tryfan was deprived and was not eligible for Communities First funding.

- The needs of families had changed and there was a need for more varied and accessible units for the population's needs.
- There was a dire need for homes for the people of Bangor and especially for individuals who were eager to live in smaller units to avoid having to pay the current bedroom tax.
- It was trusted that Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd would respect the wishes of local residents in Maes Tryfan and the residents of neighbouring wards in Bangor to let the proposed units to local people.
- Local residents wished to see the units being let to a mixture of individuals, namely young people, older people and working people.
- 100% of the flats would be affordable which would be let on social rent terms.
- It appeared from the figures on the waiting list for the Glyder Ward that 66 individuals were on the waiting list for one bedroom flats and 63 on the waiting list for two bedroom units.
- A desire to see more public bins as part of the plan.
- The application was appreciated and it was trusted that there would be a local benefit by using local labourers / businesses / collaborating with Coleg Menai for apprentices' training etc. in order to give young people opportunities.

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

(ch) The following points were highlighted by individual Members in favour of the recommendation:

- There was support for the plan locally, and the site had been vacant for some time.
- More similar applications were needed to improve housing in Bangor.

(d) A Member noted that she supported the application and emphasised the need for a bin storage for the proposed development.

In response, the Planning Manager confirmed that a suitable condition could be imposed for a bin provision.

**RESOLVED unanimously to approve in accordance with the following conditions:**

- 1. Commencement within five years.**
- 2. In accordance with the plans.**
- 3. Standard condition to restrict the development to affordable housing only.**
- 4. Agree on roof slate.**
- 5. Agree on the finish of the external walls.**
- 6. Submit details of landscaping for approval within two months of the commencement of the development.**
- 7. Timetable to implement landscaping plan**
- 8. Parking spaces and accesses to be completed in accordance with plans and to be operational before the houses are occupied for the first time.**
- 9. Prevent surface water from running onto the highway.**
- 10. Diversion of link path under Section 257 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 prior to the commencement of work.**
- 11. Welsh Water Condition**
- 12. Demolition not to take place during the bat nesting season (1 September-1 May)**
- 13. Submission of method statement to safeguard and protect the trees and their roots during the demolition and construction phase and for it to be implemented in line with what is agreed upon.**
- 14. Ensure a bin provision**

**Highway Notes**  
**Welsh Water Notes**

**3. Application number C17/1269/25/LL - Land at Tai'r Efail, Penrhos Road, Bangor**

**The Vice-chair chaired the committee for the application above as the Chair had declared a personal interest and had left the Chamber.**

Demolition of existing buildings and erection of eight affordable dwellings and creation of parking spaces.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the developer intended to transfer the properties to a registered social landlord, namely Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.

In response to the above observation, the Senior Solicitor noted that it was not possible to transfer the properties to a specific company, namely CCG in this case, and that the recommendation of planning officers would have to be amended to reflect this.

The Planning Committee was guided through the contents of the report and reference was made to the relevant policies and public consultations. Objections had been received based on the need for more affordable housing; detrimental impacts on road safety; impact on the amenities of local residents; over-development; insufficient parking spaces; anti-social problems; character of the houses was not in-keeping with the area. It was noted that the principle of the development was acceptable and it was not considered that the proposed houses would create dominating or incompatible structures based on their form, layout and designs.

Attention was drawn to general and residential matters, educational matters and transport and access matters. Having considered all relevant matters, along with all objections and observations received, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable.

- (b) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee), noted that she supported the application and that Pentir Community Council was also supportive. She highlighted the following main points:

- The development offered eight units and not eight houses as it was a small plot of land.
- There was a waiting list for housing in Bangor with 40 individuals requiring a one bedroom flat and 68 requiring a three bedroom house, and given that there were 23 social rented units in Penrhosgarnedd, the application was to be welcomed.
- The development offered affordable housing.
- The site was convenient for units within reach of the centre of Bangor, within convenient reach of Ysbyty Gwynedd, a local shop and a regular bus service.
- The ground floor flats would be for people with mobility problems.
- Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd had confirmed that demand for this type of units was very high.
- It was trusted that consideration would be given to local people.
- It was understood that houses could not be restricted to the Pentir ward only and that the need for housing was high in neighbouring wards, namely Glyder and Dewi.
- Safety and traffic - whilst accepting that traffic was heavy during weekdays, it was understood that the development would not contribute towards more traffic and indeed, it could help the cause as the access would be extended, as well as the lay by.
- It was understood that the public footpath would not affect the development and

make it  
safer for pedestrians and cyclists.

- It was accepted that the appearance would be in-keeping with the area.
- A local developer, who employed six people and was a company that sub-contracted locally, would construct the development.
- The development addressed the local need and was likely to bring benefit to the local community.

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

**RESOLVED unanimously to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to the applicant completing a Section 106 Agreement in order to transfer all of the houses to the control of a registered social landlord and to the following conditions:**

1. Five years.
2. In accordance with the plans.
3. Natural slates/materials.
4. Highways.
5. Biodiversity.
6. Welsh Water.
7. Withdrawal of permitted development rights (extensions and windows).
8. Landscaping.

**4. Application number C17/1101/13/LL - Bethesda Rugby Club, Dôl Dafydd, Station Road, Bethesda**

Full planning application for the construction of five bungalows for social letting and twelve houses for social letting, and adaptations to the existing entrance and access road.

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, drawing attention to the late observations form and specifically the observations of the Welsh Government which stated that it had no objection to the application but it had to be ensured that details for the "Departure from Standard" application on the A.5 were initially approved. Such improvements would have to be in accordance with the requirements and it was trusted that such an application would be submitted to the Welsh Government in March in order to be approved by them. Following receipt of information by the applicant, it was noted that it could be ensured that houses would be affordable by imposing a planning condition to this end. Therefore, as a result, attention was drawn to the fact that the recommendation would be amended as no legal agreement would be required.

Reference was made to the relevant policies and responses to the consultation process within the report.

A description of the application was provided along with the main relevant planning considerations, noting that the application was acceptable in principle.

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

(c) The following points were highlighted by individual Members:

- Would it be possible to hold a further discussion regarding the design of the bungalows to include washing facilities that would be suitable for wheelchair users?
- There was a reference to open spaces but no reference to the statutory requirements for children to play safely. Children were expected to walk 300 metres to the nearest

open space from this development, and according to one Member, a contribution towards play equipment should be requested.

(ch) In response to the above observations, the Planning Manager explained:

- the developer could consider the suitability of the design in accordance with the needs.
- It was noted that paragraph 5.11 referred to play areas, and the fact that there was an open space 300 metres away from the proposed development. If one was familiar with the site, it was noted that there was a formal play area in terms of equipment, a rugby field and a sufficient safe play area nearby for children and based on this it would be unreasonable to request more play provision than what was proposed. In terms of the concern, it was ensured that officers had referred to policies and supplementary guidance and that the recommendation was based on relevant requirements.
- It was ensured that properties would be let in accordance with housing policy.

**RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Officer to approve the application subject to receiving formal permission from the Economy and Infrastructure Department, Welsh Government, that amendments to the access (A.5) are acceptable prior to any work commencing on the site and to the following conditions:-**

1. Five years.
2. In accordance with the plans.
3. Natural slate.
4. Highways.
5. Biodiversity.
6. Welsh Water.
7. Removal of permitted development rights.
8. Landscaping
9. All houses to be affordable houses.

**5. Application number C17/0846/18/LL - Land at Bro Rhiwen, Rhiwlas, Bangor**

Residential development to include five affordable homes for local need along with associated accesses and parking.

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the development was for local need, parking spaces on the site which were on the northern outskirts of the village of Rhiwlas. The site was located outside the development boundary as contained in the Local Development Plan, but it directly abutted the boundary and could therefore be considered an exemption site.

Reference was made to relevant policies and the responses to the statutory consultation process noted in the report. Objections had been received based on the fact that the site was outside the development boundary; set a precedent; loss of green space; disturbance during hours of work on the site; lack of valid evidence of local need; impact on the Welsh language; weakness of any conditions relating to affordable homes; detrimental impact on the village infrastructure.

It was noted that the principle of constructing affordable housing on this particular site had been based in Policy TAI16 of the Local Development Plan which noted that a development immediately adjacent to development boundaries must be for 100% affordable housing if it can be shown that a local need had been proven for affordable housing that could not be addressed within a reasonable time-scale on a market site within the development boundary. Given the assessment and, subject to the proposal complying with the other policies referred to in the report, along with taking into consideration the observations of the Council's Housing

Strategic Unit, it was considered that the application was acceptable in principle. It was noted that the plan of the proposed development intentionally followed the ribbon pattern of this part of the village and although the houses would appear contemporary, the external materials reflected the external materials of similar houses nearby. In terms of general and residential amenities it was not considered that any substantial over-looking would be created. Although it was acknowledged that an element of disturbance would derive from the development during the construction work, it must be considered that this would only be temporary. In the context of transport and access matters, it was noted that the proposed accesses and parking arrangement was acceptable by the Transportation Unit subject to including relevant conditions.

The applicant would need to sign a legal agreement in order to bind the five houses to affordable housing and he was currently in discussions with a registered housing association to take ownership of the houses in future.

Having considered all relevant matters, all of the observations and objections received, it was recommended to approve the application.

(b) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted:

- the proposed development was located outside the development boundary and an application from a developer and not an individual searching for a house.
- the Planning Committee was reminded of the boundaries set in the Local Development Plan less than a year ago and that they had been included in it for a reason, and it had been approved at an enormous cost for the Council.
- 80% of houses in Rhiwlas had three bedrooms and that there was no real need for more similar houses but instead bungalows should be considered for the elderly living in three bedroom houses and who were eager to downgrade to smaller houses.
- there was no sense in approving affordable housing developments if there was no real need for the houses.
- three areas had already been earmarked for construction in the Local Development Plan and the applicant of the application in question owned one of these areas.
- an appeal was made to the Planning Committee to refuse the application.

(c) In response to the observations above, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that generally every development should be within the development boundary, but there were exceptions; for example, agricultural circumstances and more relevant, developments that adjoined the boundary provided that it was an extension and that there was evidence of need. It was noted that housing policy approved this type of development in accordance with evidence of need.

(ch) A Member noted that he shared the concerns of the Local Member in terms of the demographic nature of the village and it was apparent that there was already an under-use of social housing in the village. The member was of the opinion that evidence of need should be received and he suggested deferring making a decision on the application in order to ask the developer to submit evidence of need for this type of house, compared with one / two bedroom units. Another Member noted that it would be useful to receive further information from the registered housing association regarding the waiting list for social housing in the area as well as confirmation that they would commit as landlords to the proposed development.

(d) It was proposed and seconded to defer making a decision on the application and to request robust evidence regarding the need for the proposed houses.

- (dd) During the ensuing discussion, it was asked whether it would be possible for the Planning Department to submit figures of applications for houses that had already been approved and how many remained in order to ensure compliance with the designated allocation in the Local Development Plan.

In response to the observation above, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that systems would be in place to track applications that were approved and that they would then be in a position to report either to the Planning Committee or in future training sessions.

**Resolved: To defer making a decision on the application and to ask the Senior Planning Service Manager:**

- (i) **to ask the developer for evidence of real need for three bedroom social housing in the village of Rhiwlas;**
- (ii) **to receive confirmation whether a registered housing association was interested in the units or not as well as information about waiting lists for social housing in the area.**

**6. Application number C16/0942/42/AM - Land adjacent to Maes Twnti, Morfa Nefyn, Pwllheli**

Residential development of nine affordable dwellings.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that this was an outline application to consider the principle of developing the site together with an access. However, the indicative plan of the proposed setting of the site had been submitted as part of the application. The application had been amended several times since the original application was submitted and it was further noted that the applicant's agent had asked for the application to be deferred. The site lay in the countryside and it was explained that the application's red line did not touch the Morfa Nefyn development boundary in the Local Development Plan. It was noted that land north of the site had begun to be developed with six houses built.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was noted that the LDP proposal maps for the village of Morfa Nefyn showed that the site lay outside the village development boundary and this was considered tantamount to erecting a new house in the countryside. Attention was drawn to policy TAI 16 which involved proposals for affordable housing on rural exception sites and the purpose of the policy was to free up sites on the outskirts of settlements to provide affordable housing where houses would usually not be approved. The policy also noted that an exception site was located directly adjacent to the development boundary and formed a reasonable extension to the settlement. The application site was located near a partly constructed housing estate. However, if looking at the map for Morfa Nefyn in the Gwynedd Maps Document attached to the LDP, it was clear that the application site was not located directly adjacent to the development boundary. Attention was drawn to paragraph 5.4 of the report with regards to the long and extensive history of the land adjacent to the application. It could be seen that the applicant had space available for housing development within the boundary without having to consider the developing land outside the boundary. Even if there was justification for affordable housing on a rural exception site, it was noted that the developer had land that abutted the development boundary and therefore there was no need to develop the site that was subject to the planning application submitted. It was understood from the Joint Policy Unit that the land bank for houses provided or that have permission for Morfa Nefyn was greater than the indicative supply for the village. Due to the current situation, it was not considered that developing the land in question was a logical development for the settlement as vacant land was available between the existing houses on the Maes Twnti estate and the application site and therefore developing the site in question would create an isolated development with vacant land between it and the existing houses at

Maes Twnti. It could not be considered as a rural exception site and it would mean building new houses in the countryside, and the local need for affordable housing had not been proved. It was therefore considered that the proposal was contrary to relevant policy requirements and the recommendation of the planning officers' was to refuse the application for the reasons listed in the report.

- (b) In her absence, it was noted that the Local Member had no objection.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the planning officers' recommendation.
- (ch) Many Members noted that this type of development should not be approved on the site in question as it would intrude on open countryside.

**RESOLVED unanimously, to refuse for the following reasons:**

**The proposal would entail building new houses in the countryside where they are not needed for a rural enterprise. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Strategic Policy PS 17 and Policy PCYFF 1 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026 (31 July 2017) together with Planning Policy Wales (9th Edition, November 2016) and Technical Advice Note 6: Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities.**

- 2. **The local need for affordable houses has not been proven and it would not be possible to provide the provision within the development boundary. In addition, the application site is not located directly near the development boundary and it does not form a reasonable extension to the settlement, therefore it cannot be considered as a rural exception site. The proposal is considered to be contrary to the requirements of Policy TAI 16 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026 (31 July 2017).**

**7. Application number C17/0930/08/LL - The Old Bakery, Penrhyndeudraeth**

Full application to demolish an existing garage and erect a new two-storey residential house, with a new vehicular access.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the site had been located in a mixed and dispersed residential area within the development boundary of Penrhyndeudraeth. Reference was made to the relevant policies and the responses to the public consultations within the report. Attention was drawn to the fact that the proposal complied in principle with the appropriate requirements. It was noted that the contents of the report explained that the planning officers had no concerns about the material planning considerations. However, it was noted that there was some local concern and these matters were dealt with in paragraphs 5.12 to 5.14 of the report. It was not considered that these matters outweighed the material policy considerations. Having considered all relevant planning matters and the observations received, the planning officers' recommendation was to approve the application subject relevant conditions.
- (b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**RESOLVED unanimously to approve in accordance with the following conditions:**

- 1. **Commence the work within five years.**
- 2. **In accordance with plans.**
- 3. **Slates and external materials**
- 4. **Agree on a Building Management Plan / working times**

5. **Highways**
6. **Landscaping/protecting trees/biodiversity**
7. **Welsh Water conditions.**
8. **Boundary treatments to be submitted and agreed**
9. **Withdrawal of PD**
10. **Party Wall Act Note**

**8. Application no. C17/1022/23/LL – Plas Tirion Farm, Llanrug, Caernarfon**

Erection of poultry unit for the production of free-range eggs, driveway, turning space, landscaping, storage area for manure and two silos.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that Policy CYF 6 of the LDP stated that proposals to erect a new building in the countryside for a business or industry would be approved if two criteria could be satisfied, namely:
- That the scale and nature of the development is acceptable given its location and size of the building in question;
  - That the development would not lead to a use that conflicts with nearby uses or has an impact on the viability of similar uses nearby.

The proposal met the criteria and was acceptable in principle.

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

It was noted that it was believed that restrictions imposed on the form, scale, elevations (dark-green coloured covering), along with the setting of the unit in the landscape, would mean that any resulting visible impact would be from close vistas only and any views of it from a distance would be intermittent.

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

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

In response to observations from members in relation to the chickens' living conditions, the Senior Development Control Officer noted that regulations were in place outside the planning system to manage well-being matters. The Planning Manager added that the shed was of the highest standard and that the chickens would be free range.

**RESOLVED To approve with the following conditions:**

1. **Five years.**
2. **In accordance with the plans submitted with the application.**
3. **Dark-green colour for the external elevation of the unit and the manure storage area.**
4. **Agricultural use of the building only.**
5. **Public Protection conditions relating to the restriction of noise levels from the temperature control fans and concentration of particulates.**
6. **Complete the landscaping plan in accordance with the details submitted with the application and the time-scale for completing this.**
7. **Agree on the colour of the feed bins/silos.**

**9. Application no. C17/1056/39/LL - Frondeg, Llanengan, Pwllheli**

Application to site 10 touring caravans and a static caravan for site manager, shower and toilet block, acoustic fence, earth bank, new access drive and parking spaces for a nearby chapel

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the applicant alleged that the field had been used to site caravans in the past. It was reported that information from the applicant was received late on Friday but as there was no planning right or lawful development certificate in place, it was no possible to place any weight on the information.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the site was located approximately 100 metres from nearby houses, was outside a development boundary as designated in the LDP, was within a Conservation Area and within the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

It was noted that the AONB Unit had stated its concern that the new caravan site, and the ancillary developments, would affect the AONB and Conservation Area. It is felt that landscaping would not sufficiently reduce the impact of the proposal on the landscape and that it would not overcome concerns relating to the prominence of the site in the landscape within the AONB and the Conservation Area.

It was reported that the Transportation Unit had stated that the proposal would be likely to have a substantial impact on road safety.

It was noted that it was not believed that the proposal was acceptable in principle and based on the matters noted in the report, namely that the proposed development would be likely to have a substantial detrimental impact on views of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the village's Conservation Area, and on road safety, it would likely impact the amenities of nearby residents.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:
- The observations of the Transportation Unit could not be seen on the track and trace system on the Council's website and so far no response had been received from the Unit to the enquiry submitted
  - The documents attached to the application had not appeared on the track and trace system in a timely manner
  - One field was already being used for the Caravan Club, and another field had touring caravans
  - The existing access was dangerous with a lack of visibility therefore another method to gain access had been included in the application
  - The Biodiversity Unit had recently confirmed that they no longer objected to the application
  - There was enough space on the site for planting in order to screen the development.
- (c) A Member acting as the Local Member (not a Member of this Planning Committee), supported the application and made the following main points:
- There were parking problems on the road therefore the fact that the application included a car park which could be used occasionally in association with activities at the Chapel was welcomed
  - There had been a touring caravan site on the site since the 1950s and the applicant had evidence to prove this
  - The existing access was dangerous
  - The applicant was looking to improve the facilities on the site.
- (ch) In response to the above observations, the Planning Manager noted:

- He was unaware that the information on the application was not on the Council's website in a timely manner, but there might have been a problem
- The agent had not taken advantage of the opportunity to receive advice before submitting an application where these concerns would have been highlighted
- Sites operating as a Caravan Club site had up to five touring units, and the application submitted was for 10 units. Photographs had been received but a formal application with additional evidence in terms of a lawful development certificate would have to be submitted.
- He accepted that the road would be dangerous if the use as a Caravan Club was for five units, but creating a more urban development with more vehicular movements was not the solution
- He confirmed that biodiversity matters had been resolved.

(d) Proposed and seconded to undertake a site visit.

The proposer noted the following main points:

- A site visit should be undertaken due to the concerns in terms of visual amenities, impact on the amenities of nearby residents and the access and road safety
- Agreed that there was a need to consider whether the static caravan for the manager was essential for the site
- The site had been used as a Caravan Club site for many years and beyond with provision currently on the site for 10 touring units
- Should the applicant make an application for a lawful development certificate, and should it be successful, the use would be authorised unconditionally. Therefore, it would be better to approve the application with conditions.

(dd) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:

- A site visit would be wise considering the matters noted
- It was not possible to theorise in terms of lawful development, it was a matter for the applicant to prove that there was historic use. It was likely that additional information was required in the report on the use as a Caravan Club site in order to help the members
- If the applicant had taken advantage of the opportunity to receive advice before submitting the application, the officers might have advised him to make an application for a lawful development certificate - the planning application before the committee was premature in the context of consideration of any historic use
- With regards to transportation, a site visit would be appreciated in terms of the location of the access.

**RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.**

## **10. Application number C17/1094/36/LL - The Cross Foxes, Garndolbenmaen**

Change of use from public house to dwelling house.

(a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the existing building provided a public house facility on the ground floor and a living unit on the first floor.

It was noted that Policy ISA 2 of the LDP stated that change of use of a community facility should be withstood unless it would be possible to comply with one of three options. Part iii. was relevant in this case, as it involved a facility that was commercially run, and evidence of the following had to be presented:

- That the current use had ceased to be financially viable
- That it could not reasonable be expected it to become financially viable

- That no other community use could be established
- That there was evidence of genuine attempts to market the facility, which had been unsuccessful

Having weighed up the evidence submitted against policy ISA 2 and the fact that it was highly unlikely, based on the information to hand, that the building's use as a public house would be reinstated on account of the costs and nature of the community, it was believed that justification had been shown for the change of use.

An observation had been received from the Economic Development service based on the information submitted with the application, which stated that a rural public house business of this type faced a number of challenges. They had assessed the information submitted and that it confirmed that it was not viable in its current form.

Attention was drawn to additional observations that had been received, noting that a concern had been noted in terms of the evidence submitted. It was noted that the Joint Planning Policy Unit had noted that the proposal must be considered in the context that the unit had been empty for an extended period and that it had been marketed for a reasonable price for a continuous period of 12 months. Evidence was received with the application in relation to marketing the building unsuccessfully since 2011, which was a significantly longer period than the required 12 months. It was considered that the requirements of Policy MAN 4 of the LDP had been met.

Observations/objections to the proposal had been received from local residents and a petition objecting to the proposal which raised a number of matters relating to the proposed development and recent history of the business.

It was believed that sufficient evidence has been submitted to prove that the use as a public house was not viable and although reference had been made in observations received to an intention to attempt to buy it locally, there was no strong evidence to suggest that the use was likely to be reinstated in the near future. It was, therefore, believed that there was justification for the proposed change of use to approve the building to be used as a house.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:-
- The proposal was contrary to Policy MAN 4 of the LDP as it did not conform to the criteria
  - There was no such provision within close proximity and with a recent reduction in bus services, there was no service to the village after 9.30pm
  - The public house had been for sale for years whilst it was still open but it had not been advertised locally
  - The public house was closed for four night per week and had only open after 9.00pm on Friday evenings before closing down
  - It was intended to set up a community enterprise and the property was viewed on 22 February
  - The Committee was asked to either refuse the application or to defer it in order to give the group an opportunity to set up the community enterprise.
- (c) Taking advantage of the opportunity to speak, the applicant noted the following points:
- Times had changed, and the public house had closed three times in recent years
  - There had been no support locally for the enterprise when the public house was open
  - The Village Hall Committee was looking into having a bar and parties were already being held there
  - The public house had been advertised for sale sufficiently
  - The building should not be left to fall into despair
  - The objector had not commenced the work of establishing a community initiative.

- (ch) A member noted that the application should be refused because it would take time to set up a community enterprise and not enough time had been given to the community group, therefore they should be given an opportunity to fundraise before moving forward. In response, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the property had been on the market since 2011 therefore it would be difficult to defend a refusal on these grounds in an appeal. He noted that it was an option to defer the application in order to give the community group more time but a timetable had to be set because there was a risk in terms of failing to make a decision within the statutory period. In response to an enquiry from a member, it was noted that a four week timetable had been given to a similar planning application.

It was proposed and seconded to defer the application in order to give the community group an opportunity to declare its intentions.

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

- If the application was to be deferred, would it be possible to receive information at the next meeting where the application would be discussed in terms of the community group's appeal?
- There was sympathy for both sides. It would be a shame to lose a community resource therefore the need to give the community group more time was understood, but evidence of local support was noted, with a public meeting held and a business case and work programme in place, in addition to information about any proposal made
- The building could be a community hub, given that there was no local shop or post office. Such a community enterprise would take time, and if the application was deferred, it was greatly hoped that there would be positive evidence before the Committee the next time
- It would be a shame to let the building deteriorate
- Would a month be a sufficient period for the community group to declare its intentions?
- If the application was approved, would the use as a public house end immediately?
- There was a need to consider whether the use as a public house was viable. The objector had noted that the public house was open for limited hours before it had closed down
- A month was insufficient. Given the timetable of the Committee meetings, six weeks would be sensible.

- (d) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:
- It was fair to see evidence of the community group's intention, including evidence in terms of buying the property
  - The use as a public house would end when the planning permission would be implemented, commencing the work of converting the building into a house.

**RESOLVED to defer the application in order to give the community group an opportunity to testify their intention and to re-submit the application to the Committee in six weeks.**

#### **11. Application no. C17/1161/39/LL - Land adjacent to Tŷ Adda, Abersoch, Pwllheli**

Amend condition 4 of planning permission C15/0901/39/LL to amend the design of the proposed house.

- (a) The Enforcement Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that only the design of the house was under consideration, along with minor amendments to the site formation. The principle of the development had already been accepted, and planning permission had already been granted for the house.

It was noted that the amended plan meant that the house would still be in the same location but its angle would change slightly, re-locate the platform on the first floor, a small increase in the size of the house, and two dormer windows on the northern elevation, rather than one previously. It was reported that the garage shown on the original plan had now been removed from the application by an amended plan received on 15 February.

In light of the public consultation, objections were received to the application on grounds of the amenities and privacy of local residents, the impact of the garage on mature trees, and that a platform did not need to be provided as part of the application. The garage had been removed from the application, therefore it was presumed that this solved the concerns raised by the public and by Biodiversity officers. There was no concern about the impact of the proposal on the amenities of nearby residents.

It was considered that the proposed amendments were acceptable and it was recommended to approve the application with the conditions listed in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:
- There was planning permission in place and the application was for minor changes to the design
  - The application had been discussed with the officers
  - Three local men had come together for the development in order to make money
  - The amendment in the design and a lower pitched roof was an improvement on the plan originally approved.
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:
- The proposal included external stairs and a balcony
  - Concern from the Community Council in terms of the privacy of nearby neighbours
  - Concern that the balcony would be used for entertainment and a condition had been imposed on the original planning permission that it was not to be used for entertainment. It was difficult to enforce the condition
  - The amendments did not allay the concerns of local residents
  - The Committee was asked to refuse the application or impose an additional condition to prevent use of the balcony for entertainment.

In response to the local member's observations, the Planning Manager noted:

- External stairs and a balcony were quite a common feature in the vicinity
- The nearest houses were approximately 19 metres away and there would be no direct overlooking due to the layout/angle of the houses
- In terms of the condition to restrict use of the balcony for entertainment, the size of the balcony restricted the use that could be made of it.

- (d) Proposed and seconded to approve the application.

A member noted her concern regarding the number of applications that were being received to change a design that had originally been approved.

A member noted that the design was better than the original design.

**RESOLVED to approve with the following conditions:**

1. **Five years**
2. **In accordance with the amended plans dates 04/01/2018 and 24/01/2018**
3. **Slate for the roof of the house and garage.**
4. **Agree on external finish.**

5. **Landscaping plan**
6. **Welsh Water conditions.**

**12. Application number C17/1175/42/LL – Mownt, Edern, Pwllheli**

Extension to the touring caravan site to site 12 additional touring units (increase the numbers from 20 to 32).

- (a) The Enforcement Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the site was located in the countryside and within a Special Landscape Area and the Llŷn and Bardsey Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

It was noted that policy TWR 5 of the LDP permitted proposals to develop touring caravan sites provided they conformed to a series of criteria and it was believed that this proposal did so. The site had already been hidden well in the landscape due to existing hedges and *cloddiau*. The nine units would be sited along the existing boundaries with an intention to reinforce the existing screening. By ensuring that this work would take place, it was considered that the design, layout and appearance of the proposal were acceptable and that it would not cause substantial harm to the landscape.

It was reported that the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal and, although it was an increase of more than 10% in terms of the number of units, there would be no detrimental impact on the safety of the local roads network.

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 applicant had set up a high quality touring caravan site and that the proposal was an opportunity to expand the site.

**RESOLVED To approve with the following conditions:**

**Commence within five years.**

2. **In accordance with submitted plans.**
3. **The number of units on the site at any given time to be restricted to 32.**
4. **Restrict the season to between 1 March and 31 October.**
5. **Holiday use only.**
6. **A register to be maintained.**
7. **No storing of touring caravans on the site.**
8. **Carry out the landscaping plan.**

**13. Application Number C17/1193/08/LL - Car Park, Portmeirion**

Application for the creation of a site for up to 28 vehicles and the erection of a building for reception, shop and washing facilities.

- (a) It was reported that the above application had been withdrawn.

**14. Application Number C17/1211/18/LL – St. Helen, Tai Newyddion, Penisarwaun, Caernarfon**

Demolition of existing detached church hall and construction of church hall attached to the existing Santes Helen Church, Penisarwaun, and creation of parking on site for seven vehicles, including two spaces for the disabled.

- (a) The Enforcement Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the new building would provide a space for community activities, a shop and café, vestry, stores and toilets.

It was noted that the site was located on the outskirts of the village in a residential area, and within the development boundary of the village of Penisarwaun in the Development Plan. The church was not listed, but the site was located within a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

The proposal was considered acceptable in terms of visual amenities, residential amenities and privacy. Also, the proposal complied with policies in the Local Plan in relation to retail. A protected species survey was submitted with the application and the Biodiversity Unit and Natural Resources Wales did not have an objection to the proposal, provided that the developer acted in accordance with the recommendations of that report.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal, provided that the developer followed the submitted plans.

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:
- The proposal would be an over-development of the site.
  - That there was a community hall in Penisarwaun and so there was no need for the hall;
  - Concerns in terms of road safety;
  - Local people did not need or want the hall.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:
- The existing hall was deteriorating and the new hall would add to the community;
  - That disabled access and toilets would be included in the hall;
  - Had discussed with the Transportation Unit and planning officers in the context of managing speed on the road;
  - The shop would not be for profit and it would not compete with other places;
  - There were no planning grounds to the objections received;
  - That letters of support had been received from local people.
- (ch) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:
- That he saw both sides but that he tended to side with the objectors;
  - That local people did not see a need for a hall and they were concerned in terms of road safety;
  - That there was a prosperous community hall in the school.
- (d) Proposed and seconded to approve the application.

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

- Although they sympathised with the objectors, the hall would be an asset to the village and the church;
- Would it be required to hold a public consultation in terms of installing speed humps as part of the method of managing speed on the road?
- That the comments of the Community Council and Local Member noting that there was no need for another village hall should be followed;
- That the shop element of the development was to be welcomed;

- Did not see the need and it would be an over-development of the site and would conceal views and take away from the beauty of the church;
- It would not be an over-development of the site.

(dd) In response to the above, the officers noted:

- It would not be required to hold a public consultation as the proposal would involve adding a pair of speed humps to the existing ones. That the proposal would be discussed with the Community Council and that the proposal would be advertised.
- That there was an existing hall on the site and that the proposal involved its demolition and construction of a new hall. Over-provision was not a reason that provided robust grounds to object to the proposal.

**RESOLVED to approve with conditions:**

1. **Time - Five years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Slate roof and the external finish of the building to be in-keeping with the church.**
4. **Highways / Parking Conditions**
5. **Limit the surface floor area of the shop / café**
6. **Work to be in accordance with the Bat Report**
7. **Condition to limit the demolition and building work to 09.00 - 18.00 Monday to Friday, 09.00 - 13.00 on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays or Bank Holidays.**
8. **Archaeological conditions**
9. **Welsh Water conditions**

**Notes**

1. **Highways**
2. **Welsh Water**
3. **Archaeology Service**
4. **Natural Resources Wales**

**15. Application number C17/1218/44/LL - Land near - Entrance to Garreg Goch Caravan Park, Morfa Bychan Road, Morfa Bychan, Porthmadog**

Creation of a new static caravan site for 11 caravans, and erection of new reception / lounge, creation of a new vehicular access and access road, parking space and playing field.

(a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the site was within a Special Landscape Area and outside (although parallel to) the development boundary of the village of Morfa Bychan.

It was noted that one of the main policies to consider when assessing the principle of the development was Policy TWR 3 of the LDP. The relevant part of the policy in terms of this specific application due to its location within a Special Landscape Area was part 1 which states that "proposals to develop new static caravan sites (i.e. a single or double caravan), new holiday chalet sites or permanent alternative camping accommodation will be refused in...Special Landscape Areas". Therefore, the proposal was contrary to the requirements of Policy TWR 3.

Objections had been received from local residents referring to the likely harmful impact of the proposal on their residential amenities. It was highlighted that residential housing surround the site on three sides, some within a distance of approximately 12m to some of the proposed units. It was believed that the proposal was likely to lead to further disruption and thus would be unacceptable in terms of Policy PCYFF 2 of the LDP.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the application had been submitted originally showing an intention to connect the foul drainage of the site to the main public sewer. An objection was received to this proposal from Welsh Water because it would overload the public system. Consequently, the application was amended to include private treatment work on the site and, as a result, Welsh Water's objection was withdrawn. Natural Resources Wales now objected to the proposal in its amended form by noting that "Building a private sewage treatment works in an area with a public sewage system (main sewage running through the site) is not considered acceptable from an environmental perspective."

The proposal to create a new static caravan park was unacceptable as it was unable to satisfy the requirements of the relevant policies as noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:
- That the Special Landscape Area designation had been acknowledged and respected;
  - That the land in its current form did not add to the area as it was desolate and unused;
  - The development would have a minimal impact on the landscape;
  - That Welsh Water was unable to refuse using the public sewage system so the situation could be resolved;
  - In terms of Policy PCYFF 2 of the LDP, the likely impact was insufficient to refuse on the grounds of this policy;
  - Hope that the Committee was aware of the letters of support submitted by local people.
- (c) The Local Member (not a Member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and made the following main points:-
- That Porthmadog Town Council objected to the proposal;
  - That it would be an over-development of the site and the reception/lounge building was too large;
  - That the land was not of biodiversity value as the land had been shattered for years;
  - That there was a robust policy that applications for new static caravan sites would be refused within Special Landscape Areas;
  - That the report from Gillespies noted that there was no capacity for new static caravan sites or extensions to them in the Porthmadog Area;
  - The need in the area for a new site was questioned.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

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

- That the land had been cleared. It is noted in the report that a petition had been received regarding the loss of green land, had letters of support to the application been received?
  - That a site visit should be undertaken;
  - That this area did not need a further increase in traffic levels and as the site was within a Special Landscape Area, the proposal was not acceptable;
  - The development would have a visual impact on the landscape and would affect the residential amenities of nearby residents.
- (d) In response to the above, the officers noted:
- Information was noted in terms of the letters received in support of the application on the additional observations paper;
  - That the development was unacceptable in principle and that the report of Gillespies noted that there was no environmental capacity in the landscape for static caravan

sites. As the application was contrary to principle, it was considered that holding a site visit would serve no purpose.

**RESOLVED To refuse for the following reasons:**

1. **The proposal involved the creation of a static caravan site within a Special Landscape Area. Policies TWR 3, AMG 2 and AMG 3 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (July 2017) do not permit the development of new static caravan sites within Special Landscape Areas. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policies TWR 3, AMG 2 and AMG 3 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (July 2017).**
2. **Policy ISA 1 approves proposals when adequate infrastructure capacity exists. In this case, it is not believed that providing private sewage treatment work within an area with a public sewage system is acceptable and therefore it is not believed that the proposal satisfies the relevant requirements of policy ISA 1.**
3. **The relevant requirements of Policy PCYFF 2 states that proposals will be refused if they would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities of occupiers of local residences due to increased activity, disturbance or other forms of nuisance. The Local Planning Authority is of the opinion that the proposal is likely to lead to further disturbance and would be unacceptable in terms of policy PCYFF 2.**

**16. Application number C17/1225/39/LL – Bwthyn Pant Gwyn Caravan Park, Sarn Bach, Pwllheli**

Site two additional static caravans to the existing site along with site improvements and siting a static caravan as an office / reception.

The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the site was within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

It was noted that the main policy to consider when assessing the principle of the development was Policy TWR 3 of the LDP. The relevant part of the policy in terms of this specific application was part 3. It was explained that this policy may permit small extensions to the site's surface area and /or re-locating units from prominent locations to less prominent locations subject to compliance with criteria. Attention was drawn to the fact that the policy did not allow an increase in the number of static caravans on sites within the AONB or the Special Landscape Areas. The proposal was contrary to the requirements of Policy TWR 3 in terms of sites within the AONB.

It was acknowledged that the development showed some improvements to the facilities of the existing site and it was proposed to have additional landscaping on a part of the site, however, the proposal did not overcome the basic principle of Policy TWR 3 and Gillespies' report that there was no capacity for additional static caravans within the AONB.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:
- Policy TWR 3 was being implemented as one wide brush;
  - The AONB Unit did not object to the application;
  - The application site was an infill site in the middle of other caravan sites;
  - Gillespies' report in terms of landscape capacity and sensitivity was not prescriptive;
  - The Committee was asked to consider holding a site visit.

- (c) The following main points were made by a member who was acting as a local member (not a member of this Planning Committee):
- That the site was tidy and was located in the middle of other caravan sites so it would not have an impact on the area;
  - That the proposal would lead to a small extension to the existing site;
  - That the AONB Unit noted that there would be no detrimental impact on the AONB;
  - That an office/reception could be provided in an alternative way to the static caravan;
  - The proposal would mean raising safety standards and providing a phone and Wi-Fi;
  - Suggested that a site visit should be undertaken.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

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

- That there were plenty of caravans in the area and it should be refused in accordance with Policy TWR 3;
- That a site visit should be considered as the application proposed improvements to the site;
- That the proposal was contrary to Policy TWR 3 and the Gillespies report which noted that there was no capacity in the landscape for this type of the development. Considering the policy and the report, astonishment that the AONB Unit noted that there was capacity in the landscape;
- That a phone and Wi-Fi could be provided on the site in its current form;
- Concern considering the observations of the Caravan Officer that an existing breach of conditions with the fire-spread risk needed to be dealt with;
- That the site was located within the AONB and so the application should be refused;
- The risk of setting a precedent should the application be approved.

**RESOLVED To refuse for the following reasons:**

1. **The proposal involves increasing the number of static caravans on an existing static caravan site within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Policy TWR 3 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan does not allow an increase in the number of static caravans or chalet units on existing sites within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to criterion 3 (iii) of Policy TWR 3 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (July 2017).**
2. **It is not considered that locating a static caravan in the location in question as an office / reception contributes anything towards improving the design, layout and appearance of the site and its position in the surrounding landscape and therefore, it is not considered that the proposal meets the requirements of criteria 3 (vi) of Policy TWR 3 Of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (July 2017).**

**17. Application number C17/1266/16/LL – Land at Bryn Cul, 2 Tal Gae, Tregarth, Bangor**

Erect a 17.5m high telecommunications mast, including three antennae, two broadcast satellites, two equipment sheds and one measuring cabinet and associated work.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the site was located against a backdrop of high, wooded land, above the A55 trunk road. The plan was an amendment of a previously submitted plan on a site approximately 200m south that was withdrawn because of concerns about the possible impact on a nearby scheduled ancient monument.

Attention was drawn that observations had been refused objecting to the application during the public consultation based on the concern regarding the possible impacts on wildlife, harmful visual impact, harm to the designated historic landscape, harmful impact on nearby relics, potential harm to the nearby trees, harmful to the amenities of the users of the busy public footpath nearby and that the development could be harmful to the historical well nearby thus polluting the water flowing from it.

It was noted that Policy PS 3 of the LDP supported provision of new facilities to extend or improve connectivity through communication technologies in all areas of the Plan, subject to appropriate protection measures.

It was reported that a declaration of Conformity with the ICNIRP requirements (International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection) had been submitted as part of the application, which confirmed that the development had been certified as complying with the ICNIRP guidances, namely the internationally recognised guidance for this type of development.

With this type of development, it was inevitable that the proposed structure would be partly visible from public places as it needed to be in a fairly open location to ensure that it worked to its full capacity. Nevertheless, in this case, it was believed that the site's wooded location meant that the tower would be fairly hidden from most public places. On the whole, it was considered that the tower was unlikely to have an obvious long-term impact on the visual amenities in the local area.

It was noted that information had been submitted with the application listing other sites that were considered prior to deciding on this site. It was clear that these had been disregarded for various reasons. It was therefore acknowledged that an attempt had been made to find other sites but that this had been identified as the most suitable for the proposal following the consideration of practical, technical and amenity matters.

It was not believed that there would be any significant detrimental impacts on the amenities of local residents as a result of the development. It was noted that the site was suitable in terms of its location and was acceptable in terms of its impact on the general and residential amenities of the 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, an objector noted the following main points:
- That he was speaking on behalf of the local residents who objected to the proposal;
  - That relocating the telecommunications mast was a material change rather than a change to the proposal;
  - That the applicant had not assessed sites as part of the existing application and the pre-application process had not been followed;
  - That the provision was needed but there was a need to weigh up in terms of the impact on local amenities;
  - The Committee was asked to visit the site as the site was inappropriate to the site and that there were better sites and that the visual impact of the mast would be worse than what was shown in the photos submitted as part of the application.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- That the 3G and 4G service provision in this area was very poor and that users were unable to use the provision indoors;

- That the site of the mast had been moved by 200m since the previous application in response to CADW's observations;
- That the development would bring social and economic benefit to the area;
- That it would contribute to the Government's objective in terms of providing a 3G and 4G service;
- That the mast would be 45m away from houses;
- The mast would be higher than the trees nearby, reducing the height of the mast would lead to the installation of more equipment.

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

- That the new site was further away on lower land, and questioned how the signal would reach the dip;
- Concern regarding the visual impact;
- Concern that the proposal would lead to polluting the water in the nearby well;
- Of the opinion that the mast was too close to houses;
- Would like to see a diagram to see by how much the signal would extend;
- Confirmation would need to be received on how electricity would reach the site; either overground or underground;
- Suggested that a site visit should be undertaken;
- That there were better alternative locations for the installation of a mast.

(d) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application in order to hold a site visit and receive more information.

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

- That information needed to be received in terms of the area that the mast would provide a signal to and in terms of the need and the existing provision;
- That the visual impact had been assessed in the report but not the technical aspect;
- That information needed to be received about the number of other sites assessed;
- That the provision was needed in Tregarth;
- That it appeared that the mast was located on the wrong side of the hill and that more information needed to be received;
- That there was a lack of provision in the area and that it affected the economy;
- That the companies associated with the application had extensive experience in the field;
- That confirmation was needed about where the electricity line for the mast would be and whether a track needed to be created for it;
- That the concerns needed to be discussed with the Local Member before contacting the applicant;
- That confirmation was needed that the water sources would be safe and that the development or the associated engineering work would not affect the flow of water into the well.

**RESOLVED to defer the application in order to hold a site visit and receive more information.**

The meeting commenced at 10.30am and concluded at 3.50pm.

---

**CHAIR**