

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 22-03-21

---

**Present:** Chair: Councillor Eric M. Jones  
Vice-chair: Councillor Gareth A. Roberts

**Councillors:** Stephen Churchman, Elwyn Edwards, Simon Glyn, Louise Hughes, Anne Lloyd Jones, Berwyn Parry Jones, Gareth T. Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, Edgar Owen, Eirwyn Williams and Owain Williams

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Planning and the Environment), Cara Owen (Planning Manager), Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Service), Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Glyn Llewelyn Gruffudd (Senior Development Control Officer) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democratic Services Officer)

### 1. APOLOGIES

None to note.

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

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

Councillor Elfed Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C19/0003/18/MG)

Councillor Eirwyn Williams (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C20/0040/35/LL)

Councillor Judith Humphreys (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.5 on the agenda (planning application number C20/0942/22/LL)

### 3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

### 4. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 1 March 2021, as a true record.

### 5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

**RESOLVED**

## **5.1. Application: C19/0003/18/MG - Rhiw Goch, Clwt Y Bont, Deiniolen, Caernarfon, Gwynedd**

Reserved matters in relation to application C13/0611/18/AM for a residential development of 17 houses (including two affordable units) and a new access - amended plans and additional information

a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded upon the background of the application. It was explained that the principle of the proposal had already been discussed and approved under the outline application, and this application in question was only for assessing elements relating to scale, appearance, landscaping and access as reserved matters. In addition to the reserved matters, there was also a need to comply with conditions relating to submitting details as follows:-

- (i) a Desk Study to assess the risk of potential pollution on the site;
- (ii) further information/explanation on flood alleviation measures;
- (iii) a Management Statement to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority for the watercourse that ran through the site;
- (iv) providing and implementing a surface water management system;
- (v) access path to the watercourse, improvements to the inlet arrangements and removal of culvert.

It was reported that the site was located to the south-west of Deiniolen on a section of derelict land which was, historically, used for the climbing equipment manufacturing industry. Amended plans had been submitted with the application and it was noted that the relevant policies along with the responses to the consultation period had been included in the report.

In the context of visual amenities, the principle of erecting 17 houses on the site had already been accepted. Given the layout of the site within the landscape along with its proximity to the built areas, it was not believed that the development would have a significant impact on the layout, character or views in or out of this historic landscape. It was reiterated that the site was deteriorating in terms of visual amenities and was an eyesore in the landscape. Approving this application was likely to be a step towards improving the visual amenities in this part of the village. Also, given the layout and design of the proposed houses on the site in relation to the setting and form of nearby dwellings, it was considered there would be no significant or substantial impact on the residential or general amenities of these dwellings

It was reported that it was proposed to create a new access to replace the existing access for the housing development from the nearby class III county road. Despite receiving an objection to the application on grounds of road safety, the principle of creating a new access had already been accepted. Detailed plans had been submitted along with a Flood Consequence Assessment, an Addendum to the Flood Consequence Assessment, Statement of the Details of Water Discharge from the Site, Method Statement for Works on improvements to the watercourse that ran through the site and a Management Plan for the watercourse to meet the requirements of the outline application. It was reiterated that the Council's Water and Environment Unit had given permission to the applicant to undertake improvement works to the watercourse which included installing a gravel trap and building an inlet chamber with a weed screen. The work should ensure that floods would not derive from the watercourse to the proposed houses or out to the adjacent road.

A Phase 1 and Phase 2 Contaminated Land Survey Report had been submitted. After investigations and taking earth samples, no contamination sources had been discovered

within the site. It was reiterated that the Public Protection Service was happy with the conclusions of the Contamination Report.

It was considered that the planning application met with the requirements of local and national planning policy.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:
- Accepted that the application was for assessing some elements of the development only, but needed to highlight flooding issues in the area - needed to ensure that preventative work was completed
  - There was a need to hold a discussion with Council officers regarding the opinion on the development in relation to the UNESCO candidacy
  - A request to consider increasing the number of affordable homes within the development
  - Concern regarding the lack of pavements - undermining safety requirements
  - A request to consider using Welsh names for the houses
  - No objection to housing, but housing for local people was needed
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application
- ch) During the ensuing discussion members made the following observations:
- Concern regarding the low number of affordable housing
  - A suggestion that the housing design should be more innovative
  - Need to consider the lack of pavements
  - A request to provide a play area
  - Concern about flooding - was the site itself subject to flooding?
  - A suggestion to consider whether or not using the word '*nepell*' in paragraph 5.6 of the Welsh version was correct
- d) In response to the comments, the Monitoring Officer noted that the principle of the development had already been established and that the committee was now discussing the reserved matters. The Assistant Head of Planning and the Environment reiterated that the matters that could be discussed were limited. It was highlighted that Natural Resources Wales, the Drainage Unit and the Transportation Unit did not object to the application and in terms of UNESCO, it was noted that Cadw, as one of the statutory consultees, had not objected to the application. It was noted that the justification for approving the application was based on the evidence submitted in the report.

In response to a question whether or not the design of the houses had been agreed, the Development Control Officer noted that originally outline plans had been submitted setting out the layout of the houses. It was reiterated that the current plans were amended ones, the layout had been resubmitted and the design of the houses was more acceptable. The Planning Manager noted that the housing mix had not been a consideration when the outline application was approved - that housing mix was a matter that had been introduced as part of the supplementary planning guidance since then. Consequently, it was not possible to revisit matters relating to housing mix.

**RESOLVED: To delegate powers to the Assistant Head of the Environment Department to approve the application, subject to the following conditions:**

**Conditions:**

- 1. In accordance with the revised plans.**
- 2. Comply with the requirements of the Ordinary Watercourse Land Drainage Consent.**

**A note for the applicant relating to Public Protection Service advice on contaminated land.**

**5.2. Application C20/0040/35/LL - Sibrwd y Gwynt Morannedd, Cricieth, Gwynedd  
Erection of a new residential dwelling**

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that the application related to constructing a new house and creating a vehicular access off the estate road. It was explained that the site was located within Cricieth village's development boundary; on a narrow plot within an estate of various houses on a slope that elevated towards the back of the site, and was situated between two properties with another property directly in front and opposite a narrow estate road. It was reiterated that the application had been subject to several planning applications and an appeal - six planning applications had been refused on the site in the past and permission granted on the site via an appeal on grounds of the plans submitted as part of application C08D/0870/35/LL, and it was confirmed that this permission was still extant on the site.

The application had been submitted to the Committee at the Local Member's request.

It was reported that the report dealt with the matters raised in the previous appeals; and assessed the proposal against the latest Local Development Plan policies. It was noted that appeal decisions (refusal and approval) for the site had clearly stated that there was potential for a two-storey property on the site to cause overlooking and an unacceptable impact on the nearby residents on either side and to the front. The appeal decisions depended on the window locations and floor levels to ensure that there was no adverse impact on nearby housing.

It was explained that the house in question was now 4m wider and 1m longer than the property that had been approved. It was noted that the property had been designed with an angle on the front in order that all the elevation did not look out in the same direction (to seek to avoid overlooking). Therefore, the dwelling under consideration now was slightly lower in terms of its roof ridge and also wider and comprised of more openings on the first floor as opposed to the original permission. It was considered that the reduction in height did not compensate for the detrimental impact of increasing its width and adding openings on the first floor. It was considered that the proposal would have a significantly more detrimental impact on the property of Pen y Bryn situated directly in front of the site, than what had been mentioned as acceptable during the 2011 appeal. It was also considered that the size of the property (specifically its width and bulk) meant that the property was not in keeping with the estate's building pattern and design.

It was noted that transportation, access and drainage matters were acceptable.

Based on the above assessment, it was considered that the proposal was unacceptable as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) considered that the house in question, due to its size (specifically its height and width), the location of windows/doors and balconies on the front elevation and the finished floor levels would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities and reasonable privacy of the property situated in front of the site.

It was recommended to refuse the application for the reasons included in the late observations form that had been amended to include external materials / finish.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following points: Drone footage was used to demonstrate the impact of overlooking from the location of the new house.

- That officers, having seen the evidence, had agreed that the "documents demonstrate that the overlooking from the balcony window would be the same as that approved on appeal".
- Appeal decision observations - "I do not consider that it will be possible to see the higher section of the proposed dwelling as damaging within policy terms. It is the inter-visibility between the main windows that is of potential concern."
- It would not be possible to see the windows of the proposal from the opposite house, unless the owner intended to sunbathe on the roof.
- To compare overlooking with the next door house, Hafan Deg, the difference was like night and day.
- There were no windows on the side of the house. The balcony was enclosed, in order to be able to look outwards only.
- The 'house' that had been approved was a two-storey house that measured 180 square metres. The application in question was a two-storey house, measuring 177 square metres, and was therefore smaller than the one that had already been agreed.
- The pattern on the estate was contrary to the officers' comments as the majority of the houses were located close to one, two or three boundaries on their land.
- There was an element of overlooking on the estate. Each house was unique in terms of its shape, size and form with window sizes, the number of balconies, conservatories and patios ranging on the estate.
- The reasons for refusal were not only misleading, but were also incorrect - this was an improvement on what had been approved on appeal.
- That the house was SMALLER than what had been permitted.
- That the house was set FURTHER BACK than what had been permitted.
- That the house was LOWER than what had been permitted.
- That the house's location on the plot COINCIDED with the pattern on the estate.
- That every house on the estate was different.
- The house did not cause overlooking.
- A young family returning to Cricieth to settle down.

c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:

- That he agreed with the decision of the Town/Community Council
- He was supportive of the application
- No objection

ch) Proposed and seconded to approve the application contrary to the recommendation

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

- That the estate consisted of a mix of architectural designs
- The style of housing in Cricieth was not uniform
- The surface-area of the amended plan was smaller
- It was intended to dig into the ground to avoid an intrusive appearance
- The balcony was enclosed therefore no impact on adjacent housing
- Happy with the layout and size of the development
  
- Concern regarding external materials
- No objection to the scheme, but sought to improve its appearance

dd) An amendment to the proposal was proposed and seconded - to defer the decision in order to hold further discussions with the applicant on alternative materials.

In response to the proposal to hold further discussions with the applicant, the Planning Manager noted that it would be possible to consider this and suggested using slate for the roof which would be more in keeping with its environment.

**RESOLVED:**

**To defer in order to hold further discussions with the applicant regarding alternative materials for the roof and external walls**

**5.3 Application C20/0986/45/LL - Black Lion, Abererch Road, Pwllheli, Gwynedd**

**Demolition of public house and erection of six houses and associated works**

a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application to demolish a two-storey public house and replace it with a row of six 2 or 3 bedroom houses. The houses would be three-storey and include the following:

- Ground floor: hallway, toilet, utility room, garage/workshop, bedroom/office
- First floor: living room, kitchen, bathroom
- Second floor: two bedrooms (one en-suite)

It was reported that the site was located within the development boundary of Pwllheli town, within a predominantly residential area with a few commercial uses nearby; in a prominent position near one of the main transport routes leading into and out of the town. The property and its use as a public house was currently empty.

It was highlighted that the proposal was unacceptable for several reasons relating to

- Loss of the public house
- Lack of justification for the houses
- Lack of justification for the housing mix
- Lack of provision of affordable housing

Concerns were noted about the design, scale and density of the development along with the lack of amenity space - the application was considered an over-development of the site and it would have a detrimental impact on the area.

It was highlighted that the assessment drew attention to a lack of information on several matters, such as biodiversity, flooding and drainage and language matters, and therefore it was not possible to assess the proposal in full. It was recommended to refuse the application for these reasons. It was reiterated, due to the fundamental objections, that the officers had not gone back to the agent to ask for the necessary information that did not form part of the application. It was noted that no request had been received for pre-application advice.

b) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

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

- A historic public house that had changed hands many times
- The impact of COVID-19 was likely to cause increasing pressure on development - there was therefore a need to secure the affordable element
- There was a need to encourage applicants to seek pre-application advice - a booklet was suggested outlining the information that was required when submitting an application

- The website needed to be better at highlighting language statements

## **RESOLVED:**

**To delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to refuse the application.**

### **Reasons**

- 1. Given the scale, design and number of proposed dwellings, it is not considered that the development would be in keeping or of an acceptable appearance within the local area. In addition, given the narrow nature of the site, the number of units included in the plan and the lack of amenity space associated with the individual houses, it is believed that it would be an over-development of the site and harmful to residential amenities. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the relevant requirements of policies PCYFF 2 and PCYFF 3 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan.**
- 2. On the grounds of a lack of appropriate housing mix, lack of justification outlining how the proposal would meet the needs of the local community or any provision of affordable housing as part of the application, the Local Planning Authority does not consider that the proposal is acceptable. Consequently, it is believed that the proposal is unable to meet the requirements of policies TAI 1, TAI 8 and TAI 15 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan, along with the relevant advice given within the Affordable Housing and Housing Mix SPG.**
- 3. Although a document identified as a Community and Linguistic Statement was submitted as part of the application, it does not include sufficient information and as a result, it is not believed that sufficient information is available to assess whether the proposal is in accordance with criterion 1c of Policy PS1, which requests a Welsh Language Statement that would show how the proposed developments protect, promote and strengthen the Welsh language. On this basis, the Local Planning Authority has not been convinced that the proposal would not affect the Welsh language in the plan area.**
- 4. It is not believed that sufficient information has been submitted which justifies the loss of the facility on the grounds of the relevant requirements of policy ISA 2 as well as the advice given in Supplementary Planning Guidance: Change of use of community facilities and services, employment sites and retail units; which states that evidence would be needed that an attempt has been made to suitably market the property.**
- 5. The site lies within an area that is at risk of surface water flooding and as no Flood Consequence Assessment was submitted that would have considered the safe development of the site and demonstrated that the proposed development would not divert surface water towards other properties, it is not believed that the proposal is acceptable based on flood risk and that it is, consequently, contrary to criterion 8 of policy PS 5, criterion 4 of policy PS 6 as well as the instruction given in paragraph 11.1 of Technical Advice Note 15.**
- 6. No preliminary survey for protected species within the site and buildings was submitted and no biodiversity improvements are included as part of the proposal. Consequently, it is not possible to ensure protection and improvements to local biodiversity and as a result, it is believed that the proposal is unacceptable in terms of the requirements of the criteria of policy AMG 5, along with the advice given within TAN 5.**

#### 5.4 Application C20/1020/39/LL - Rhandir Caravan Park, Lôn Plas Crwth, Mynytho, Pwllheli

To relocate seven caravans within the curtilage of an existing caravan site.

- a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application noting that the proposal involved changes within an existing static caravan site, by relocating seven caravans from their current locations which were dispersed across the site to a single location. The proposed improvements would include,
- the construction of a 1m high earth bank with hedgerows along its top, alongside the units in their new location.
  - undertaking landscaping and planting within the plots that would become vacant within the site once the units were relocated.

It was explained that the current planning permission on the site was for 62 static caravans, and as the proposal involved the relocation of 7 existing caravans, the actual number of caravans would remain the same.

The site was located in the countryside within the designations of the Western Llŷn Special Landscape Area and the Llŷn and Bardsey Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. Access to the site was gained along a private road off the closest public road. It was noted there were established hedgerows along the site's perimeters and within, in addition to a scattered vegetation of trees.

The application had been submitted to Committee as the size of the proposed development was greater than that which could be dealt with under the delegated procedure.

The amendments were considered as proposed improvements. Reference was made to the site's planning history and the responses received during the consultation period. Following the completion of a full assessment of the relevant planning matters, it was considered that the proposal complied with relevant policies.

- b) It was noted that the Local Member had noted that he was 'in full agreement with the recommendations and observations of the Planning Officer'.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- That it must be ensured that there was adequate space between caravans
  - Applications to fill in gaps should be refused
  - Needed to ensure that the applicant complied with the setting distances
  - Needed to confirm that there was a licence for the site
  - Holiday units were growing in size - suggestion to reduce / review the number of caravans on sites if the units were increasing in size.

In response to the observations about ensuring adequate space between caravans, it was noted that licence requirements stipulated this as well as Fire Service requirements. The Monitoring Officer reiterated that the licence was based on planning permission and the caravans were to be sited in accordance with the licence's stringent conditions. It was noted that the application in question, to relocate seven caravans was an appropriate application which fell within policy requirements - should the caravan site wish to expand further, a new application would be required.



## **RESOLVED:**

### **To approve**

### **Conditions**

- 1. Time**
- 2. Comply with plans**
- 3. Landscaping**
- 4. Restrict the units to holiday use**
- 5. Restrict plot use / restoration plan**
- 6. Restrict the numbers**

## **5.5 Application C20/0942/22/LL - Land near Maes Dulyn County Road, Penygroes**

Application to erect 24 houses, create a new access an internal estate road, confirmation of public footpath, drainage work and ancillary work.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that it was a full application to provide 24 residential units and all of them would be affordable homes. The application had been submitted by Grŵp Cynefin (Registered Social Landlord) and was a joint scheme between Grŵp Cynefin and Gwynedd Council. It was explained that the site, already owned by Grŵp Cynefin, was located within the development boundary of Penygroes, and had been designated for housing as included in in the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (LDP). The application was split into several different elements, which included:-
- The provision of affordable units that included 10 two-bedroom houses, 3 three-bedroom houses, 2 three-bedroom houses, 1 four-bedroom house and 8 one-bedroom flats that would be available in the form of a mixed affordability tenure, which was to be agreed. Provision of infrastructure to include an estate road and associated footpaths, fences/railings and stone walls.
  - Provision of parking spaces for each house, create a new access from the adjacent class II county road (B4418) as well as providing a footpath through the site in compliance with the public footpath that crosses the site.
  - Provision of an amenity plot within the site, along with areas to accumulate water and a wildlife corridor.

It was reported that the applicant had succeeded to obtain grants funded by Welsh Government to build all residential units as affordable units.

Reference was made to affordable housing matters and housing mix. It was noted that the applicant had submitted an Affordable Housing Note. It was explained that the tenants would be selected via a local housing allocation policy. It was estimated that there were 70 applications on the social housing waiting list in the area and the lack of supply meant that some would have to wait a long time to find a home. It was considered that the proposal was a big step in the right direction to re-home people in their local area by developing a quality scheme that would meet recognised needs by providing an appropriate mix of units.

It was noted that visual, general and residential amenities and transportation matters were acceptable. In terms of flooding and drainage matters, it was noted that Welsh Water had confirmed it was satisfied that the assets would be suitably protected.

In referring to language matters, it was reported that a language statement had been submitted with the application along with a further amendment. It was reiterated that further observations had been submitted (22/3/21) by the Language Unit confirming that it did not object to the application as the educational matters and the need for housing had been confirmed.

It was reported that the Education Department's Information Officer had noted that Ysgol Gynradd Bro Llew had exceeded its capacity and therefore there was justification to ask for a contribution to address the shortfall in capacity by contributing a specific sum of £64,614. It was reiterated that the applicant had received confirmation from the planning officers that an educational contribution was needed and this could be secured by signing a legal agreement under Section 106.

In the context of play areas, it was highlighted that there was a lack of play areas with equipment for children in the area. It was noted that the applicant was proposing 1040m<sup>2</sup> of open space without equipment on the site and the agent had explained that equipment could not be provided on the proposed plot because access would be required to utilities such as Welsh Water. Although the proposal included a proposed open space, the space did not meet the need for a plot with play equipment. In order to comply with the requirements of policy ISA5 of the LDP and the SPG: Open Spaces in New Housing Developments, confirmation had been received from the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Planning Policy Unit that it would be required for the developer to provide a contribution of £8911.54 through a 106 agreement in order to secure appropriate provision in the local area.

It was not considered that the proposal was contrary to local or national policies and there was no material planning matter that outweighed the policy considerations. Consequently, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable subject to the completion of a 106 Agreement, ensuring contributions for education and an open space and to include the suitable conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following points:
- That the development was very important to Grŵp Cynefin - as it was on its home turf.
  - A substantial consultation on the development had been undertaken via a housing needs survey held by the Rural Housing Facilitator and also through the pre-application process.
  - The plans had been amended several times - the development of the 24 new homes and the mix submitted in the application was in response to the feedback and concerns raised.
  - That the land was already owned by Grŵp Cynefin and they were encountering challenges as they developed with the need to address significant abnormal land conditions and the location of services in relation to the site. However, the development as designed and submitted did address this.
  - It was proposed to erect 24 new low carbon and energy efficient homes, and they had been successful in receiving grant funding from Welsh Government through the Innovative Housing Programme.
  - As a Registered Social Landlord, all new homes would be available to local people on a mixed affordability tenure. The tenure would be in line with the affordable tenures allowed under the conditions of the grant available from Welsh Government for the development .
  - They would work closely with Llanllyfni Community Council, Gwynedd Council and Tai Teg to agree on a local allocation policy for these new homes.

- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:
- There was an immense need for housing for local people
  - Lack of housing was one of Gwynedd Council's challenges, therefore the development was to be welcomed.
  - It was an innovative, environmentally friendly development
  - It responded to the need for housing locally
  - Proud of the scheme
  - Full support of the scheme
- ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:
- That the houses were of good quality
  - The layout was acceptable
  - Happy with the conditions and the design
  - Welcome the Trees Unit's recommendation of a condition
  - Need to consider using Welsh names for the houses
  - Welcomed the development
  - Need for housing locally

In response to a comment that 24 was a large amount of houses and there was a need to avoid seeing a situation of empty houses that could arise and could lead to them being sold on the open market, the Planning Manager noted that the applicant was a registered landlord that would receive a grant that would bind the houses as affordable ones only - the houses would be allocated for renting through a partnership between the Council and Grŵp Cynefin.

In response to an observation on Welsh house names, it was highlighted that there was a statutory procedure for naming houses and that it would not be reasonable to set a condition to ensure this. It was reiterated that Building Control had responsibility for naming estates and numbering houses. It would be possible to encourage people to use Welsh names - a suggestion was made to include a note to highlight these wishes.

## **RESOLVED**

**To delegate powers to the Assistant Head of the Environment Department to approve the application subject to the receipt of a favourable response from Welsh Water and for the applicant to complete an agreement under Section 106, in order to ensure a financial contribution for the educational provision and open space contribution.**

### **Conditions**

- 1. Five years.**
- 2. In accordance with the documents/plans submitted with the application.**
- 3. Natural slate.**
- 4. Samples of materials and colours for the houses as well as details of the solar panels to be agreed with the LPA.**
- 5. Highways Conditions.**
- 6. Soft and hard landscaping.**

7. **Biodiversity and Tree Conditions**
8. **Working hours limited to 8:00 - 18:00 during the week, 08:00 - 12:00 on Saturdays and no working at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.**
9. **Details of Path.**
10. **Agree on details regarding Welsh names for the development together with advertising signage informing of and promoting the development within and outside the site.**
11. **Ensure a plan/arrangements to provide the affordable units.**
12. **Removal of general development rights for the affordable units.**
13. **Submit a Construction Method Statement including parking provision for the builders' vehicles.**
14. **Submit outdoor lighting details to be agreed with the LPA before they are installed.**
15. **Archaeological mitigation measures condition.**
16. **Safeguarding the open space for the future.**

**Note: Inform the applicant of the need to submit a sustainable drainage strategy plan for approval by the Council's Water and Environment Unit.**

**Note: Inform the applicant of the response of Welsh Water referring to a public sewer that crosses the site.**

**Note: Welsh names for the homes and the estate/roads within the estate itself.**

The meeting commenced at 11:00am and concluded at 13:10pm.

---

**CHAIR**