

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 05-09-22

---

### Present:

**Councillors:** Edgar Owen (Chair)  
Elwyn Edwards (Vice-chair)

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

**Officers:** Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Department - Planning and the Environment), Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Service), Sion Huws (Senior Solicitor), Keira Sweenie (Planning Manager), Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Arwel Thomas (Development Control Officer) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer)

### Others invited:

Local Members: Councillors Gareth Williams and Gwilym Jones

## 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors:- Elwyn Jones and Gareth Coj Parry; Kim Jones (Local Member)

Condolences were extended to Councillor Elwyn Jones, on the loss of his wife. Sympathies were sent to the Chair and his family on their loss. The Members and officers stood in silence as a mark of respect and remembrance.

## 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 Elin Hywel in item 5.2 (C22/0242/34/LL) on the agenda as she had a connection with the Local Member.

The Member was of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest, and he withdrew from the meeting during the discussion on the application.

In terms of the protocol, Cllr Gruffydd Williams stated that the Local Member for item 5.2 (C22/0242/34/LL) on the agenda had been in contact with him.

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

- Councillor Cai Larsen (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 (C21/1111/14/LL) on the agenda.
- Councillor Gareth Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.3 (C21/0573/33/LL) on the agenda.

- Councillor Gareth A. Roberts (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda (C22/0525/11/LL).
- Councillor Gwilym Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.4 (C21/1151/44/LL) on the agenda.

### 3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

### 4. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 4 July as a true record, subject to noting that Cllr Gareth M. Jones was not present.

### 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 NUMBER C21/1111/14/LL Fron Goch Garden Centre, Pant Road, Caernarfon, LL54 5RL

**Application to erect a building to store garden furniture together with erecting an adjacent building to exhibit and sell furniture, open storage area and extension to existing customer car park**

The application had been deferred at the Planning Committee in July in order to undertake a site visit.

Some of the Members had visited the site on 02/09/22 in order to familiarise themselves with the layout and context of the proposal within the local environment.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application to extend Fron Goch garden centre by constructing a building to store garden furniture as well as nearby space to display and sell furniture, open storage area. The building would measure 46.2 metres long (at the longest point), 22.7m wide and 7.8m to the highest part of the roof a total of 977 square metres. It is also intended to extend the existing customer car parking area, as well as create a 1452m<sup>2</sup> storage area, located between the proposed building and the new south-western boundary of the site.

As retail use already existed on the site, it was suggested that the principle of the proposal should be considered against Policy MAN6 (Retail in the countryside). In accordance with policy MAN6, proposals for small-scale shops and extensions to existing shops outside the development boundary will be permitted, as long as the proposal complies with the criteria included in the policy. The first criterion requires the proposal to be a subservient element of the existing business on the site. The

explanation to Policy MAN 6 states that the most suitable location for shops is within the boundaries of the settlements of towns and villages. However, small scale shops run jointly with a business that already exists on the site is likely to provide a useful service and employment for rural communities.

Having weighed up the proposal in the context of the relevant policies, it was not considered that the proposal was acceptable to approve since the location, density and increase in size was unreasonable, and the proposal would have a substantial negative impact on the character of the area, which is contrary to many policies. In addition, it is unclear if the impact on biodiversity and the natural environment is acceptable and it was not considered that there was justification for the loss of agricultural land deriving from the proposal.

After giving full consideration to all material planning matters, it was not considered that the proposal met planning policy objectives.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:
- That he was supportive of the application and disagreed with the grounds for refusal.
  - Biodiversity elements - confident that it would be possible to proceed without having an impact on the ancient trees and mature hedges. Protecting these would be advantageous in terms of attracting people to a wonderful and natural location.
  - That the development is substantial but the site is not open. It is not visible until it is reached. The proposed building does not meet the threshold for a 'large building'
  - The proposal is not subsidiary to the existing business - it cannot be attached to the main building but it 'fits' into the site - provides and rationalises order and site safety for users: Is integrated to the business and it is not independent in any way.
  - Loss of agricultural land - the site owners own the land and it is not used as agricultural land at present and there is no intention to do so in the future - it is not high-quality agricultural land.
  - A local employer and a significant employer.
  - That the Welsh language can be heard and is visible on the site.
  - That the business deserves support from the Local Authority and not obstructions.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, contrary to the recommendation.
- ch) In response to the proposal, the Assistant Head of Planning and Environment Department noted that the relevant policies prevented large-scale developments in the countryside and that the policy was not unique to this development. He suggested that Members should consider a condition that the use was ancillary use to the main building (subservient) and an additional condition to prevent any sales from the development.
- d) During the ensuing discussion members made the following observations:
- That the extension was not large, considering what was on the site already.

- That there was no intention to use the land for agricultural use.
- That it did not create a detrimental impact on the appearance of the countryside - the location was hidden.
- It created good jobs for local people. The Welsh language was 'alive' there.
- Disappointment at the lack of response from the Economy Department.
- That the Community Council and Gwynedd Council's Transportation Unit supported the proposal and Natural Resources Wales had not submitted observations.
- That the site was a popular attraction, was neat, tidy and was a good employer.
- That garden centres were popular - were good for the body and mind. The business was growing and expanding in line with the breadth of interest in the field.
- Provided support for a sustainable future - a future where we will be encouraged to grow our own food.
- That the extension was a natural step. The plan retained the shape of the land and protected the surrounding land.
- Supported the proposed conditions.

In response to a comment regarding the propriety of the conditions and whether a second consultation should be held with the applicant and the Local Member, the Head of Legal Services noted that the Committee, despite the fact that it was going against the recommendation, had the right to draw up and impose conditions. He noted that if the applicant was unhappy with the conditions, then he had the right to appeal.

The Planning Manager highlighted the relevant conditions, and noted that the conditions reduced the risks of acting contrary to policy. The Head of Legal Services confirmed that there was nothing improper in what was being conditioned, and in accordance with the advice offered that the conditions supported the decision; it was the Committee's responsibility to make a decision.

**RESOLVED: To approve with conditions**

1. **Five years.**
2. **In accordance with submitted plans.**
3. **Use to be ancillary to the main garden centre.**
4. **Additional car parking area to be completed before the building is used.**
5. **All internal and external signs to be in Welsh only or bilingual with a priority given to the Welsh language.**
6. **Biodiversity conditions (light, biodiversity enhancements).**
7. **Landscaping.**
8. **Land drainage plans to be agreed.**
9. **Restricted to the sales of comparison goods only, no sale of convenient goods (food)**

**5.2 APPLICATION NUMBER C22/0242/34/LL Land near Penlon, Clynnog Fawr, LL54 5PE**

**Construction of new house and parking spaces**

The application had been deferred at the Planning Committee in July in order to undertake a site visit.

Some of the Members had visited the site on 02/09/22 in order to familiarise themselves with the layout and context of the proposal within the local environment.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Development Control Officer highlighted that this was a full application to erect a two-storey house on a plot of land near Pen Lôn, in front of dwellings known as Y Ficerdy and Clynnog House, with the Tŷ Isaf and Court Cottages residential dwellings to the rear of the site, within the Clynnog Fawr residential area and development boundary. Here there is also a rear access to Beuno Sant Church, which is also being used by the five existing nearby dwellings. It was noted that the site was located immediately adjacent to Listed Buildings, located within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and within a Conservation Area, and although a number of observations were received in relation to parking and turning spaces, the Transportation Unit did not have an objection.

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee at the request of the local member.

Having considered all relevant matters, including local and national policies and guidance and the observations received, it was highlighted that it could not be recommended to approve the application due to the failure to satisfy the requirements of the LDP's TAI policies, relating to the suitability of the development to comply with the character of the settlement in terms of its size and scale and that there was a need to protect the open plot from over-development in order to safeguard the appearance and character of the local conservation area.

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

Reasons: A person's right to build a house and live in their home area; Clynnog was a parish and not just the Church; the design was acceptable - it was a matter of opinion; The Transportation Unit and AONB did not have any objection.

- c) In response to the proposal and the comment that the Community Council supported a home for a local family, the Assistant Head of Planning and Environment Department noted that the house in question was an open market house and that it would not be possible to restrict who would be able to live there.

- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- That the design was too modern, was inappropriate and stood out in this location.
  - That it would affect the church - unsuitable for its location.
  - The design was a matter of opinion - empty land in the centre of the village.
  - That the land was in the ownership of a local person who wished to return to live in the village.
  - Did policies protect people or buildings? Was priority given to the importance of the church or keeping people local?
  - The design was acceptable - suggested imposing a condition to install stonework to the front.

- d) A vote was taken on the proposal to approve.

The proposal fell.

- e) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation.

**RESOLVED: To refuse**

**Reasons**

1. **The proposal, due to its size and setting is contrary to the requirements of policies PCYFF 3 and TAI 4 of the LDP. It is considered that the proposal would be contrary to the development pattern due to the lack of curtilage /open area around the house. It is not considered that the proposal will add to or improve the character and appearance of the site and there would be a loss of an open space between existing dwellings that will damage the appearance and character of the streetscape and the conservation area.**
2. **It is considered that the proposal is contrary to the requirements of policies PS19, PS20, AT 1 and AMG 1 of the LDP as the proposal would not, due to the loss of an open space as well as the size and appearance of the house, safeguard or improve the setting and appearance of the conservation area or the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the important views in and out of the area.**

**5.3 APPLICATION NUMBER C22/0182/30/DT Pelydryn, Aberdaron, Pwllheli, Gwynedd, LL53 8BE**

**Single-storey extension**

The application had been deferred at the Planning Committee in July in order to undertake a site visit.

Some of the Members had visited the site on 02/09/22 in order to familiarise themselves with the layout and context of the proposal within the local environment.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Development Manager highlighted that this was an application to erect a single-storey in front of a single-storey house. It was reported that the development would include extending an existing garage, which forms an integrated part of the house, 1.5m in front of it. This new element would have a pitched roof measuring 3.8m high (1.2m lower than the ridge of the roof itself), with a garage door in front.

It was noted that the property was one property in a row of detached houses nearby the B4413 class 2 road in a residential area within the boundary of the Coastal - Rural Village of Aberdaron as defined by the Gwynedd and Anglesey Local Development Plan; The property was also within the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Outstanding Historical Interest.

The application was submitted before the Committee at the request of the former local member, Councillor W. Gareth Roberts, who objected on the grounds of the visual

impact of the development on the streetscape and due to concerns regarding the amenity impact on neighbours.

Reference was made to Policy PCYFF 3 of the LDP that states that it was expected for every proposal to show a high-quality design, which gave full consideration to the context of the surrounding built environment. In this case, when considering the scale, design and materials of the extension, it was considered that the change to the appearance of the site would be very small compared with the existing house, and that no harm to the built quality of the property would derive from the development. It was noted that conditions could be imposed, to ensure that the materials used are in keeping with the rest of the house.

In addition, it was reported, despite the considerable increase in the bulk of the building, as well as an extension to the "building line" slightly to the front, there is no definitive building pattern to developments in the area, and because the change is small, the proposal would respect the built context of the site and be in-keeping with the surrounding area. As a result, it was considered that the plan submitted, due to its scale, materials and design, is appropriately in-keeping with the existing property and therefore complies with the needs of policy PCYFF 3.

Although the site lies within the AONB, and considering its urban location, the proposal in question would not affect the character of the AONB's landscape. Similarly, it was not considered that harm would be caused to the Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest - the proposal was acceptable under the requirements of Policies AMG 1 and AT 1 of the LDP and therefore there would be no impact on neighbours or the streetscape.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:
- That he fully agreed with the comments of the former Councillor.
  - This was not a 'need' to extend, but rather an owner choosing to extend in order to store a boat and tractor in a second home. The alteration was 'desirable' for 'recreational purposes' - there was no 'need' here
  - The alteration would be an eye-sore - would stand out and the height of the roof would have an impact on the amenities of neighbours, and would impair natural light
  - Plenty of agricultural sheds available locally which offered storage for a tractor and / or boat.
  - The proposal reflected an 'industrial' plot, creating an 'industrial unit' for the applicant's purposes, with no regard for others - a garage was located on the site already.
  - That there was a storage extension on the site - without planning permission.
  - Approving would set a dangerous precedent and the character of the houses in Aberdaron would be lost forever.
  - This was not a dispute between neighbours, instead they were the concerns of a former Councillor and Community Council.
  - Since the last meeting, and the article in the Daily Post, he had received unfair allegations.
  - This was a second home - it was empty for most of the year and there was no 'need' for an extension - it would have an impact on the amenities of people who lived permanently in the area. It would be unfair to approve.

In response, the Planning Manager confirmed that Policy CYFF 2 did not ask for justification for an extension but asked for a quality design. Although it may be desirable for the owner, the impact on neighbours had to be considered also. It was reiterated that the application had been submitted as a home use and not as a business use, therefore suggesting 'what could be got' was irrelevant here. In response to a comment about another extension on the site, it was confirmed that a further application had been submitted, but this would be considered separately to this application.

- c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application due to its impact on the AONB, as it was visually prominent and an overdevelopment.
- ch) In response to the proposal, the Assistant Head of Planning and Environment Department noted that this was a 'very small' extension to a bungalow and that it would not affect the AONB, the neighbours or the streetscape. He reiterated, should the application be refused, that it would be likely to go to appeal.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
  - A small extension
  - A similar application had been won on appeal
- dd) A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse
- e) The proposal fell.
- f) It was proposed to approve the application in accordance with the recommendation.

**RESOLVED: To approve subject to conditions:**

1. **Commence within five years.**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Slate roof**
4. **Materials to be in-keeping**
5. **Welsh Water Condition**

**5.4 APPLICATION NUMBER C22/0525/11/LL Former Coed Mawr Infants School, Bangor, LL57 4TW**

To erect 10 intermediate affordable dwellings and associated works.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Development Control Officer highlighted that this was a full application to erect 10 intermediate affordable houses and associated work. The site was described as the former site of Coed Mawr Infants School to the south of Bangor city centre; within a residential area between Caernarfon Road and Penrhos Road and within the development boundary of Bangor as included in the LDP. It was reiterated that it had not been designated for any specific use. The application was split into a number of different elements, which included:



- Providing intermediate affordable housing in the form of: Four semi-detached, two bedroom houses (4 person); Four two-storey three bedroom semi-detached houses (5 person) and two two-storey three bedroom houses (5 person) with shared equity tenure.
- Provision of off-road parking spaces.
- Creating garden areas, pavements and private curtilages.
- Alterations to existing access and provision of a road and paths for pedestrians within the site.
- Hard and soft landscaping including planting a variety of trees and shrubs.
- Creating a play area for children.
- Installation of a foul water drainage system to serve the dwellings together with a surface water system.

It was explained that the site currently included the remains of the former school building, which includes hard surfaces (concrete) and soft surfaces (grass). Reference was made to the relevant policies that had been noted in the report.

In the context of the principle of the development, it was noted that the principle was acceptable based on location, need, housing mix, use, affordable housing and density, along with the additional information submitted by the applicant. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable on the basis of visual amenities and it was anticipated that it would, ultimately, create a positive contribution to the character of this part of the streetscape.

In the context of the general and residential amenities, it was noted that a number of objections had been received from some of the occupants of Lôn Bedw and Bron y De relating to loss of privacy and noise nuisance that could derive from using the proposed play area located in the south-western corner of the site. However, given that vegetation already exists between the backs of Lôn Bedw and Bron y De dwellings and the application site; the previous site use for educational use; the intention to erect a timber 1.8m high fence around the site's external boundary; that the parcel of land was chosen on the basis of promoting passive public surveillance together with the intention to plant more vegetation nearby and within the play area. As a result, it was considered that the proposal to locate the play area within this part of the site will substantially disrupt the residential or general amenities of nearby occupants. It was reiterated that the applicant had noted the intention of installing an acoustic fence, which would reduce noise and that it would be possible to impose a relevant condition to ensure this.

When assessing the current proposal as a whole, no substantial harmful impact that would be contrary to relevant local planning policies and national advice was identified. To this end, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable, subject to the inclusion of relevant conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:
  - He was supportive of the application.
  - Disappointed that no bungalows had been included in the plan.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application
- d) In response to a question regarding demolishing the former school, it was noted that a demolition notice had been approved and implemented.

In response to a question regarding evidence of the need, it was noted that evidence had been submitted about the need for intermediate housing and that the plan filled a void in the need for this type of housing.

In response to a question regarding the meaning of intermediate housing, it was noted that intermediate housing were houses for those who were unable to buy a house on the open market and not eligible for social housing. In response to a supplementary question regarding the definition of an affordable house considering the increase in living costs, it was noted that the definition of an affordable house had been adapted, but that applicants were being assessed on salary levels and house prices - living costs were not being considered at this point in time.

In response to a question regarding the lack of detail about the open space / playing field and the statutory requirement to provide equipment, it was noted that it was possible to impose a condition ensuring the need to provide appropriate equipment on the open plot. Reference was made to the current information submitted by the Policy Unit, confirming that a provision of 70m<sup>2</sup> was provided as a part of the development, which more than meets the need for play areas and play equipment for children within the area.

**RESOLVED: To delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Five years.**
- 2. In accordance with the plans/details submitted with the application.**
- 3. Compliance with the landscaping plan along with future maintenance work.**
- 4. Secure a plan/arrangements to provide the affordable units e.g. mix, tenure, occupancy criteria, timetable and arrangements to ensure that units are affordable now and in perpetuity.**
- 5. Compliance with the recommendations of the Ecological Appraisal and Arboricultural Impact Assessment.**
- 6. Agree on details regarding a Welsh name for the development and the dwellings within the development before the residential dwellings are occupied for any purpose along with signage advertising and informing and promoting the development.**
- 7. Working hours limited to 8:00-18:00 Monday to Friday; 08:00-13:00 Saturday and not at all on Sunday and Bank Holidays.**
- 8. Submission of a Construction Method Statement to the LPA to include measures to reduce noise, dust and vibration, parking of development operators' vehicles, loading/unloading goods, storage of equipment on the site, security fences, facilities to wash wheels and a recycling/litter disposal plan.**
- 9. Relevant conditions from the Transportation Unit including ensuring visibility of 33m to the south-west from the main entrance.**
- 10. Agree on the external materials for the dwellings.**
- 11. Natural slate roofing.**
- 12. Agree on an acoustic fence**
- 13. Agree on children's play equipment.**

**Note: Need to submit a sustainable drainage system application to be agreed with the Council.**

**5.5 APPLICATION NUMBER C22/0529/15/DT Cil Melyn, 8, Stryd Warden, Llanberis LL55 4HP**

**Conversion of a flat roof to a roof terrace. First floor rear window to be converted into a door to allow access with a surrounding perimeter barrier for the flat roof with decking on the floor.**

- a) The Development Control Officer highlighted that this was an application to create a terrace by installing decking on the flat roof of an existing extension to the rear of a residential property. It is proposed to install a first-floor window to allow access to the facility. The roof measures 5.2m x 4.2m of floor area and is 3.8m above floor level. It was explained that the property was a two-storey end-terrace house in a residential area of the Llanberis Local Service Centre as defined by the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan. It also stands within the Dinorwig Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

It was noted that the application was being submitted before the Committee since observations had been received on the application from the Head of Environment Department. It was reiterated that the Local Member objected to the application since it disrupted the privacy of neighbours.

In the context of the principle of the development, it was considered that the proposed development would cause substantial overlooking impacts, would harm the amenities of the residents of nearby private properties, as well as create a dominating element.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.
- c) During the ensuing discussion, the following observation by a member was noted:
- The development would have a substantial impact on the privacy of neighbours.
  - Would create an oppressive feel.

**RESOLVED: To refuse – reasons**

**The proposed development would cause significant overlooking impact that would be detrimental to the amenities of nearby private property residents as well as to create a dominant element that may be a possible source of noise and disturbance. Therefore, the application is contrary to the requirements of policies PCYFF 2 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan in relation to safeguarding the visual amenities of local residents.**

**5.6 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/1151/44/LL Tyddyn Adi Camping Site, Morfa Bychan, Porthmadog, Gwynedd, LL49 9YW**

**Upgrade facilities including the installation of 10 touring units and 6 glamping pods to replace 25 tents authorised by a Lawful Use Certificate C12/1554/44/TC**

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application to upgrade facilities including the installation of 10 touring units and 6 glamping pods to replace 25 tents

authorised by a Lawful Use Certificate C12/1554/44/TC at Tyddyn Adi site, Morfa Bychan. The work would also include landscaping between the caravan pitches and landscaping to enclose the pod sites.

Attention was drawn to the observations of the Community Council which had objected to the application as the glamping pods appeared to be a permanent feature. It was reported that additional information had been received from the applicant, noting that the pods were one-room and were mobile and could be stored away at the end of the season.

Reference was made to policy TWR 5 of the LDP which permits proposals to develop new touring caravan sites and temporary alternative camping accommodation provided they conform to all the criteria noted. It was considered that the design, layout and appearance of the proposal was of an acceptable quality and that it was located in an unobtrusive location that was well hidden by the existing landscape features. It was not believed that exchanging the units from tents to caravans and pods would cause substantial harm to the visual quality of the landscape in this site.

It was highlighted that the site plan noted that it was not intended to install hard standings for the units and the Planning Statement stated that it was not intended to connect the pods to the drainage system. The pods will be moved to a storage site over the winter, therefore, the physical connection to the ground will be restricted. Shower and toilet blocks already exist on the site, and the users of the proposed caravans and pods use the existing provision. There is no intention to build a new building as a part of the application.

In the context of the visual amenities, it was noted that the site lies in a rural location. It was considered that the site on the whole was well screened from the vast majority of viewpoints, with weak points here and there in the landscape. It was reiterated that the site was visible from the public footpath but that the plan showed a proposal to landscape with a low density layout, open spaces and rows of hedges within the site.

Reference was made to the fact that a section of the field was located within flood zone C2 and should it be a new development, it would be contrary to policy. However, considering the fall-back position of the site, which already had permission for 75 tents, exchanging the units would not be contrary to policy as it would not increase the risk in this case. It could be argued, due to the reduced numbers, that the risk would reduce. Considering that only a small section of the field is located within a C2 flood zone and the situation with the existing permission of the site, it is concluded that the proposal would not exacerbate or increase the flood risk in this case. Therefore, it was suggested that the fall-back position meant that the proposal was not contrary to policy TAN 15 and policy PS 6 of the LDP, with an advisory note included to follow the advice of NRW's observations.

Although there was no need to submit a statement on how it was expected for Welsh language considerations to be incorporated into the development, it was noted that the applicant had submitted a language statement on how they intend to give consideration to the Welsh language.

Having considered all material planning matters, including local and national policies and guidance, as well as the observations received, it was considered that the proposal

was acceptable and that it would not have a substantial harmful impact on the landscape, the amenities of the neighbourhood or road safety.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:
- That he was supportive of the development.
  - Welcomed more space for touring units.
  - That the officer's response to the Community Council's observations about the pods was acceptable.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**RESOLVED:**

**To delegate powers to the Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Time**
  2. **In accordance with the plans.**
  3. **Restrict the number of touring units to 10 touring units, 6 pods and 50 tents.**
  4. **Holiday use only and keep a register.**
  5. **Holiday season - 1 March to 31 October**
  6. **Pods to be moved to a storage site shown on the plan between 1 November and 29 February.**
  7. **Complete the landscaping work in the first planting season.**
  8. **In accordance with the recommendations of the Ecology Report**
- **Notes: Attention is drawn to the observations of the Caravan Licensing Officer**
  - **Notes: Attention is drawn to the observations of Natural Resources Wales regarding having a flood plan in place.**

The meeting commenced at 13:00 and concluded at 14:50

---

**CHAIR**