
PLANNING COMMITTEE 2 October 2023

Present: Councillor Edgar Owen (Chair)
Councillor Elwyn Edwards (Vice-chair)

Councillors: Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Elin Hywel, Elwyn Jones, Gareth T Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Gareth Coj Parry, John Pughe Roberts, Huw Rowlands and Gruffydd Williams

Officers: Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Planning and the Environment), Miriam Williams (Legal Services), Gwawr Hughes (Development Control Team Leader), Aneurin Rhys (Senior Development Control Officer) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

Others invited:

Swyn Hughes and Elen Morris (Professional Trainees in Environment Planning) – observing

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors Cai Larsen and Gareth Roberts.

Miriam Williams (Solicitor) was welcomed to the meeting.

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

a) The following member declared that he had an interest in relation to the item noted:

Councillor Gruffydd Williams (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.2 (C23/0543/43/LL) on the agenda because he was the son of the applicant.

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

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

- Councillor Jina Gwyrfai (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.2 (C23/0543/43/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Gareth Morris Tudor Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.3 (C23/0201/08/LL) on the agenda

3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note.

4. MINUTES

The Chair accepted the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 11 September 2023, 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 NUMBER C23/0541/11/MG Maes Berea, Bangor, LL57 4TQ

Reserved matters following the granting of outline planning permission C18/0365/11/AM for nine new dwellings with integrated garages including details of the layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Senior Development Control Officer highlighted that this was a reserved matters application for the construction of nine three-storey dwellings with integrated garages in a residential area of the Bangor Sub-regional Centre as defined by the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan. Permission to develop the site was originally granted in 2018 (permission C18/0365/11/AM) and the reserved matters included landscaping, appearance, access, design and size.

He explained that the principle of developing nine dwellings on the site of the size and nature proposed herein had already been accepted through the outline permission, therefore, no further consideration was given to the principle. He noted that there was a 106 agreement in place to ensure that seven units would be for the open market and two would be affordable units, with the units still complying with the requirements of the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing in terms of size.

He added that the detailed plans submitted were entirely consistent with the indicative plans that had been submitted with the outline application; the site was located within a mixed urban area where nearby houses were of a similar design, layout and size to what was proposed.

It was considered that the proposal followed the developed pattern of the closest existing dwellings within Maes Berea estate and that their appearance was appropriate when considering their built context. The details presented would offer a logical continuation to the existing housing estate, and in that respect the proposals for landscaping, appearance, access, design and size for the development were acceptable and would not impair the character and appearance of the area.

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

RESOLVED: To approve with conditions

1. **Construction work hours**
2. **The gradient of the access to parking spaces to be agreed in advance in accordance with condition 4 of the outline planning permission**

5.2 Application Number C23/0543/43/LL Gwynus Caravan Park, Llithfaen, Pwllheli, Gwynedd, LL53 6LY

A full application to upgrade an existing Caravan Park by siting five new cabins, retention of the temporary access road and creation of a play area.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

Some of the Members had visited the site on 02-10-23

- a) The Development Control Team Leader explained that this was a full application to upgrade and extend an existing caravan site. She explained that the application included a proposal to relocate five holiday cabins within a site marked as field 470 (Golf Course) and retain an access road that was originally approved for a temporary period to serve the additional units, and the creation of a playing field. There had been a golf course here in the past, but this use had now clearly ceased. Permission had been granted in 2015 to relocate 5 static units or cabins to a location on a section of where the golf course would be (Field 470), whilst another five were to be relocated to another section of the site, namely field 471.

For clarity, this proposal would involve locating all the cabins together on field 470 instead of the permission granted to locate five on field 470 and another five on field 471. It was assumed that the proposed holiday cabins would measure the same as had already been approved. It was also proposed to construct a new earthen bund along the northern and western boundary of field 470.

It was noted that the site was located in a secluded and comparatively mountainous area in open countryside within the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. The residential building, namely Gwynus, located on part of the site was a grade II listed building. Access is gained to the site off the nearest public road along an unclassified road that veers to the north before reaching the site itself, and then along a private access road; the unclassified road was also a designated public footpath. It was noted that the site was operating and was a long-established caravan park.

The application had been submitted to the Committee as a close relative of the applicant was an elected member of the Council.

In the context of the principle of the development, it was reported that the main relevant policy was TWR 3 which discussed the site's relationship and its location within the AONB. It was noted that the third part of the policy accepted that minor extensions to the surface area of established sites and / or the relocation of units from prominent locations to less prominent locations may be permitted, subject to compliance with a series of criteria which include that the proposal offers significant and permanent improvements to the site's design, layout and appearance and its setting in the surrounding landscape.

This new area was not considered to be a small extension to the surface area of the existing caravan site and no sufficient reason was seen for the need to relocate the additional five static units to field 470 when a previously approved plan showed that it would be possible to locate them on field 471 which was within the existing site and

already developed. Although accepting the applicant's desire to improve the site, the scale and location of the proposal could not be justified without firstly considering its impact in full. It was not considered that the proposed scheme would improve the whole site's setting in the landscape and it was not considered necessary for all the static units to be relocated to outside the existing caravan site. Consequently, the proposal would create a fairly substantial extension to the existing caravan site which would lead to creating an extended site and leaving part of an existing established site empty to all intents and purposes (although it had been proposed as a playing field). It was not considered that the proposal would offer something better than what had previously been refused under application C18/0614/43/LL, and since the same policies still applied, we must be consistent in our decisions. Since nothing in reality had been proposed to improve the design, layout or appearance of the site and its setting in the landscape, it was considered that the proposal was contrary to section 3i and vi of Policy TWR 3 of the LDP.

With regard to transport and access, reference was made to an element of the application that sought permission to retain the road that had been temporarily approved previously under reference C15/0495/43/LL. The wording attached to this condition permission was *"The temporary track to be created to obtain access to field 470 must be removed and the land restored to its previous condition before commencing the fourth phase of the development"*. It was believed that this condition only applied to implementing the previous permission, and that there was no justification to retain it since the principle of moving five additional units was unacceptable. Nevertheless, the application itself was not considered unacceptable in respect of general road safety requirements and policy TRA 4 of the LDP, and since there would be a parking space near the units for the users' vehicles, should permission have been granted, this again would comply with the general requirements of policy TRA 2.

The Local Planning Authority recommended refusing the application.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant made the following observations:
- The application was not an application for more units
 - The intention was to re-locate luxury cabins
 - The proposal would improve the layout of the site which was currently disordered and inconvenient
 - The site offered an area for static and touring caravans
 - The site had been established since 1947
 - A unit had been sold to a person who had been born in the area - the cabin allowed her to return to the area – she was supportive of the application
 - Buying a cabin spared a local dwelling from being turned into a holiday home
 - The proposal was no more visible than a large agricultural shed nearby
 - The applicant intended to plant 700 native trees
 - The extension was not substantial.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- The Community Council, although they had not made representations during the consultation period due to it being the summer holidays, had discussed the

application during a meeting in September and had noted that they did not object to the application (there was a further record on their website)

- The community of Pistyll was supportive of the application as it created employment for local people
- The site was not visible from the Llithfaen area
- It did not impact on the local area
- Although noting that the site was substantial in size, there were larger sites in the area
- The intention was to get the site in order – not to extend but to relocate
- The principles of Cyngor Gwynedd and Eryri National Park's strategy identified the needs to protect communities, language and culture
- Although she was not familiar with the policies in TWR and TAN, the best sites were successful because of their good layout – there was an opportunity here to rearrange and upgrade the site
- She welcomed a communal area in the centre of the site
- The member suggested the need to see a design of what would be proposed as a play area
- The site was well-landscaped
- The application was a proposal to improve a medium-sized park owned by a local company – it was acceptable to the Llŷn countryside
- The improvement proposed responded to visitors' needs
- She did not object to the proposal

d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, contrary to the recommendation.

Reasons:

- That the proposal (planting, relocation, offering high-quality cabins and the provision of a play area) offered substantial improvements.

In response to the proposal the Assistant Head of Environment stated that the policy supported the relocation of units from a prominent location to a less prominent location. Here there was an attempt to move the caravans from a place that was currently concealed to a prominent place in the landscape, which contravened the policy. He also noted that an informal leisure or play area already existed on the site – why therefore was there a need for an additional play area? He added that should the Committee decide to approve the application, they would have to set suitable conditions.

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

- There was a need to improve the site which appeared to have dated by now
- The site was not obvious from the road
- The improvement would secure jobs, keeping the community alive
- The proposal would not affect the appearance locally
- The road should be retained in order to have access to the site
- The applicant was creating a future for the park and his family
- The cabins were luxurious and high-quality
- Visitors now expected high standards
- The Community Council and the local community supported the application
- There were mature trees and thick hedgerows around the boundary

- Further landscaping would soften the effect
- They gave thanks for the opportunity to visit the site
- A similar application had been refused by the Committee
- The AONB objected to the application because of the impact on the environment – it must be ensured that the committee was consistent in considering the observations of the AONB officers
- There was no change here from the original permission

RESOLVED to approve the application, contrary to the recommendation.

Conditions:

1. **Five years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Holiday use only**
4. **Confirm the number of units on the entire site**
5. **Submission of details regarding the play area or any associated work**
6. **That the bund is constructed prior to the relocation work**
7. **Archaeological matters**

5.3 APPLICATION NUMBER C23/0293/42/LL AROSFA, EDERN, PWLLHELI, LL53 8YU

Full application for the demolition of existing structures and construction of a new dwelling and associated works

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

Some of the Members had visited the site on 02-10-23

- a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that the application had already been discussed at a meeting of the committee which was held on 11 September 2023 where it had been resolved to defer the decision in order to conduct a site visit so that Members had an opportunity to see the site in the context of its location and its effect on local residents' amenities.

It was reported that this was a full application for the demolition of existing structures and the construction of a new two-storey, detached dwelling with associated works. The site was located within the development boundary and within the Western Llŷn Special Landscape Area and the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. It was reported that the application had been revised twice since its original submission in response to observations received and following discussions with officers. A further revised plan was received on 14.09.2023 which moved the house approximately 2m further to the south-east, in accordance with the Local Member's request.

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee for a decision at the local member's request due to concern about the size of the proposed house and its proximity to other dwellings.

It was explained that the site in question had already been developed and, therefore, was considered a brownfield site and was located within the development boundary of the village of Edern. The proposal therefore satisfied the general requirements of policies PS 5, PCYFF 1 and PS17 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan (LDP). Currently, the site consisted of industrial-like sheds that were quite simple in design, and which stood unnoticed within the plot.

It was acknowledged that the proposed house would be larger in size than the existing buildings, but in response to highlighted concerns, the building had been amended from what had been originally submitted with the new house located within the part of the site that was within the development boundary. Although this meant it was closer to the northern boundary of the site than it would have been had it been pushed further into the site, it was not considered that its location within the site was unreasonable. It was reported that the roof ridge height of the highest shed at present was 3.3m and the ridge height of the proposed roof would be 5.8m, which was slightly lower than the ridge height of the adjacent property to the west. Consequently, it was not considered that it would stand out as a completely incongruous feature in this part of the village nor that it would be entirely contrary to the general development pattern seen there. It was not considered that the proposed new dwelling would impact to a completely unacceptable level on the character and appearance of the site or the surrounding area in terms of its appearance, scale, height or mass. With the presence of mature trees and shrubs within the site that provided an appropriate cover for the site, it was not believed that the building would dominate views towards the site from prominent public places or landscape designations.

In the context of general and residential amenities, it was highlighted that the site was surrounded to the south-west, the north and the north-west by dwelling-houses with open lands extending past the southern/south-eastern boundary of the site – elements of overlooking already existed because of the location of the existing buildings. It was explained that there were trees/shrubs growing within the garden and in nearby gardens which reduced the impact somewhat. Concerns had been highlighted by neighbours during the public consultation period about the impact of the proposal on them and that it would be significantly harmful compared to the current situation. It was considered that a genuine effort had been made to reduce the impact from what had been submitted originally and that the amendments responded to the concerns that had been highlighted by planning officers.

The requirements of policy TAI 15 stated that an appropriate level of affordable housing must be ensured in the plan's area. Depending on the scale of developments, a contribution towards affordable housing provision was expected in accordance with the threshold recognised for the county's settlements. In the case of the village of Edern, which had been identified as a rural/coastal/local village, the threshold was 2 or more units. As this proposal was for the provision of one new house only, it did not meet this threshold for the consideration of an affordable provision. Furthermore, since the proposal involved the construction of a new residential dwelling, it was intended to impose a standard planning condition to restrict the property's use to a residential dwelling only, and not for use as a second home or holiday accommodation without further planning permission.

Having considered all the relevant planning issues including local and national policies and guidance, as well as all the observations and objections received, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:

- He thanked those Members who had attended the site visit
- He was in favour of the applicant's need to have a new house in Edern, the village where he had been born and bred, within the development boundary
- He welcomed the revised plans which would mean that the new dwelling would be located 2m further to the south-east from the boundary – this reduced the impact on neighbours
- It was important to consider the loss of privacy and loss of daylight in the context of neighbours' well-being
- They should adhere to the condition of moving the house further from the boundary
- Adhere to the condition of installing opaque windows
- Adhere to the condition that they must plant trees and a hedge as a clear boundary between Arosfa and nearby dwellings

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

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

- It was beneficial and important for members to attend site visits
- The site was within the development boundary
- The site was ideal
- The applicant had addressed the observations by reducing the height of the roof and moving the house further from the boundary

RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application.

Conditions

- 1. Time**
- 2. In accordance with the plans**
- 3. Agree on materials, including roof slates**
- 4. Restrict permitted development rights and windows**
- 5. Manage the type of window/glass installed**
- 6. Landscaping**
- 7. Biodiversity Enhancements**
- 8. Building control plan**
- 9. Restrict the building's use to residential use only and not as a second home or holiday accommodation**

The meeting commenced at 13:00 and concluded at 13:55

CHAIR