

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 2/9/19

---

**Present:** Councillor Elwyn Edwards – Chair  
Councillor Eric M. Jones - Vice-chair

**Councillors:** Stephen Churchman, Louise Hughes, Anne Lloyd Jones, Berwyn Parry Jones, Elin Walker Jones, Huw G. Wyn Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, Edgar Wyn Owen, Gareth A. Roberts, Eirwyn Williams and Owain Williams.

**Others invited:** Councillor Mair Rowlands (Local Member).

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Simon Glyn.

### 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 Berwyn Parry Jones in item 5.2 on the agenda (planning application number C19/0078/11/LL), as he was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.
  - Councillor Owain Williams in items 5.3 and 5.4 on the agenda (planning application numbers C19/0592/43/LL and C19/0593/43/DA), as he owned the property where the application was located.

The Members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and they withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the applications.

- (b) Councillor Mair Rowlands (not a member of this Planning Committee), declared that she was a local member in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda (planning application C19/0078/11/LL).

The member withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussion on the application in question and she did not vote on the matter.

### 2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this Committee, that took place on 22 July 2019, 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 C19/0338/42/LL – Bwthyn Bridyn, Lôn Bridyn, Morfa Nefyn, Pwllheli**

Front porch extension, alterations to the roof and extend an outbuilding to create an annexe.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application was deferred at the Committee meeting held on 22 July 2019 in order to hold a site visit and to hold further discussions with the agent/applicant regarding the first floor balcony. It was noted that after discussing with the agent, the balcony element to the front of the property had been removed from the application. Some members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

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.

A member expressed her gratitude for the site visit and that the proposal would be an improvement. A member added that she was glad that the balcony element had been removed from the application and that the proposal would secure the building for the future.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. In accordance with the amended plans
3. Slate
4. Finish to match
5. Use of annexe to be ancillary to the house only
6. NRW floor level condition

Note referring to NRW letter

**2. Application Number C19/0078/11/LL – Former Bangor City Social Club, Deiniol Road, Bangor**

Provide 38 residential units (including a mix of open market and affordable units), parking spaces and access.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the site was a plot of derelict land opposite Farrar Road and Deiniol Road in the City of Bangor. She drew attention to the fact that extant planning permission existed on the site for 49 one and two-bedroom units, which had been approved on appeal.

She highlighted that the design principles of the proposed building followed those principles that had been discussed by the Planning Inspector on the appeal. Plans were shown in relation to the extant planning permission and the application before the committee. She noted that the plans for the application before the committee was an improvement in terms of the design, with a reduction of 11 units, and that the form and height of the building were relatively similar; therefore, it would not lead to a different impact on neighbours. She acknowledged that there were some local concerns regarding the scale and materials of the development; however, it was not considered that these would be inappropriate within the site's urban context. She referred to a recent decision to approve the appeal for the former Jewson site in Bangor, where it was acknowledged, due to the site's location in a city centre, that an element of community overlooking would derive from such a development. She noted that the proposal was considered acceptable and that it would not have an unacceptable impact on the residential or general amenities of local residents, given that the form and density would not be changed.

She drew attention to the fact that there were no concerns in terms of transport and access. She elaborated that there were 38 parking spaces included in the proposal and that the site, due to its location in Bangor City Centre, had public transport links and was close to facilities.

She noted that Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd (CCG), as part of the application, had submitted an Affordable Housing Statement and a Housing Mix Statement. She noted that the information in these documents was consistent with the need that had been identified by the Housing Strategic Unit. She explained that the development would receive a Social Housing Grant from Welsh Government. She elaborated that the proposal would provide 23 two-bedroom units and 15 one-bedroom units, with nine of them being social rented housing, 17 being intermediate rent housing and 12 being open market rent housing.

She elaborated that a Community and Language Statement had been submitted with the application, despite the fact that this was not mandatory. She explained that since the application had been registered, the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Maintaining and Creating Unique and Sustainable Communities, had been adopted. She noted that a further statement had been received, which was in line with the requirements of the Supplementary Planning Guidance. It was reported that observations had been received from the Language Unit which acknowledged that it was a thorough statement, that CCG would manage the site and that the impact on the Welsh language would be neutral with the proposal meeting local need.

She noted that an educational contribution was not mandatory, but the applicant was required to provide a contribution of £8525.39 for the provision of open spaces to enhance, maintain or create suitable play areas off the site.

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

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:-
- That extant planning permission existed for the site and that the proposal submitted would lead to a reduction of 11 units;
  - That the design of the units met the affordable housing requirements;
  - That 38 parking spaces would be provided as part of the development;
  - That the proposal would meet the local need for affordable units, with 68% of the units being affordable;
  - That the site had been derelict for 10 years following the demolition of the former building and the development would improve the site;
  - That the applicant had collaborated with the Housing Strategic Unit and that the proposal would address local need;
  - That in accordance with the policy, additional priority was given to those with a local connection;
  - That the proposal would provide modern units in the City centre.
- (c) A local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:-
- That she was also speaking on behalf of Councillor Catrin Wager and local residents;
  - That she was glad that the site was being developed;
  - That the one and two-bedroom units would be mixed in terms of rent in the hope of meeting local need;
  - Concern that the design was not in keeping with the area in terms of its height and appearance;

- That 38 parking spaces would be provided as part of the development; however, it was possible that the provision was insufficient if you also considered the cars of visitors;
- That parking spaces would have to be lost along Farrar Road by painting yellow lines near the bin storage area;
- That overlooking, shadowing and loss of light would derive from the development;
- That the main concern locally was the increase in traffic. That the access to the site would create an impact as there were existing problems with two traffic streams merging onto Deiniol Road. It could add to the traffic flow of the ASDA roundabout which was busy and hazardous at times;
- That local residents had not travelled to Pwllheli for the meeting as they relied upon public transport;
- That although they were not planning matters, matters relating to a retaining wall and the impact of developing the site on nearby houses needed to be noted, as some owners had had to pay for work following damage caused from the demolition of the former building;
- That the site was strategically important and would provide affordable units;
- That she was supportive of the application; however, full consideration needed to be given to the local concerns;
- That the Committee should consider holding a site visit, especially to see the traffic situation.

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

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

- That the Transportation Unit did not object to the proposal and that the development was an improvement to the plan approved on appeal;
- Dissatisfaction with the design, density and scale of the development; however, it was an improvement to what had been permitted on appeal in terms of density, it had been set back and there was a more open elevation to the front. Acknowledgement of the observations of the local member, and despite not being wholly satisfied with the proposal, the member supported the application;
- The development was not in accordance with policy PCYFF5 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (JLDP); the design reduced the use of energy and satisfied the requirements of PCYFF6; however, it did not meet the requirements of PCYFF5 in terms of sustainable energy. That water harvesting measures were included in the proposal; however, it should be possible to incorporate more sustainable energy elements in the development, such as solar panels;
- The applicant could be informed of the member's comments in terms of incorporating more sustainable energy elements;
- That the plan before the committee was an improvement to the extant permission; however, the location of the access to the site was dangerous. This section of the road was exceptionally busy, with cars crossing and a bus stop on the other side of the road, and it was likely that cars would pass the buses as they stopped. It was anticipated that accidents would happen regularly on the road. They understood that if the application would be refused, the application would be approved on appeal;
- Satisfied with the principle of the development; however, concern in terms of the size and density of the development, along with transport matters. The access was located in the most dangerous location. Given the damage to nearby buildings as a result of demolishing the former social club, would it be possible to impose a condition to ensure that no damage was done to nearby buildings deriving from the development? Encouraged the applicant to collaborate with Menter Iaith Bangor. Would it be possible to hold a Committee meeting in Bangor when major applications in the Bangor area were being submitted before the committee?

- That assurance was needed in terms of the safety of the access;
- That the Senior Development Control Officer - Transport had noted his professional opinion regarding the access and it was acceptable;
- That Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd had policies regarding sustainability. In terms of the rent levels of the intermediate social flats, in accordance with CCG's Intermediate Rent Policy, would it be possible to receive confirmation in terms of rent levels?

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

- That there was extant permission for a substantially larger development on the site and in terms of refuse/recycling collections, the lorries would operate in the same way as they did on other streets, by staying in the middle of the road for a period of time. There was no need to paint more yellow lines; however, the situation could be reviewed should matters arise;
- That the access was acceptable as the road was one-way and there was no need to cross in the opposite direction of the traffic flow, except for when vehicles went in the direction of Farrar Road. It was estimated that between 100 - 150 additional movements would derive from the development when considering the thousands of current daily movements;
- That there was extant planning permission for a development of 49 units that would provide eight affordable units on the site already. There was an acknowledged need for affordable units in the area and the proposal would provide mixed units in terms of their type and occupancy;
- Understood the concerns in terms of design; however, there was a need to bear in mind that the size, design and bulk matters had been aired as part of the appeal and it was concluded that the design was acceptable. That the design of the building was a better design to what had been approved on appeal;
- In terms of sustainability, a balanced assessment was undertaken, giving consideration to policies PS5, PCYFF5 and PCYFF6 of the JLDP. It was not possible for the proposal to satisfy policy PCYFF5 in full due to the density of the development. It may be possible to incorporate solar panels into the development; however, it would lead to changing the design of the building. The proposal met policy PCYFF6 in terms of energy conservation and was in accordance with the requirements of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS). Accepted the member's views; however, having considered the extant planning permission and the commitment of the applicant to other policies in terms of sustainability, the proposal was acceptable;
- That the access had been approved as part of the extant planning permission for 49 units, along with more recent permission to use the site as a car park;
- In terms of CCG's Intermediate Rent Policy, the rent levels of the intermediate social flats would be 80% of the value of the open market rent.

**RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application subject to the applicant completing a Section 106 agreement to ensure a financial contribution for the provision of open spaces and the following conditions:-**

1. Five years.
2. In accordance with the revised plans.
3. Samples of materials and colours for the building to be agreed with the LPA.
4. Highway conditions for parking and the access.
5. No unit to be occupied until the sustainable water system has been completed and is fully operational.
6. Soft and hard landscaping.
7. Development to be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation measures referred to in the Preliminary Ecological Report.
8. Working hours limited to 8:00 - 18:00 during the week, 08:00 - 13:00 on a Saturday and no working at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

9. Agree on details regarding Welsh names for the development together with advertising signage informing of and promoting the development within and outside the site.
10. Ensure that a bin area is provided and remains within the site prior to the occupancy of the units.
11. Ensure a plan/arrangements to provide the affordable units.
12. Opaque glass condition

**3. Application Number C19/0592/43/LL – Parc Carafanau a Chwrs Golff Gwynus, Pistyll, Pwllheli**

Install septic tank in field 470 along with a soak-away system for the tank.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the location of the tank was different to what had been approved under a previous application to locate holiday units in an adjacent field. She explained that the tank had been installed and therefore it was a retrospective application. She noted that the sewage tank could not be seen above ground and Natural Resources Wales had licensed the use.

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 an enquiry from a member, the Planning Manager noted that the observations of Natural Resources Wales on the application in terms of biodiversity were standard and they reminded the authority of their role. She referred to the observations of the Biodiversity Unit on the additional comments form which confirmed that there were no biodiversity concerns.

In response to a further comment, the Planning Manager noted that she accepted the observation, the additional comments form was not on the website; however, the decision notice was the statutory document.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. In accordance with the plans.
2. Agree upon and implement a reseedling plan to restore the site.

**4. Application Number C19/0593/43/DA – Parc Carafanau a Chwrs Golff Gwynus, Pistyll, Pwllheli**

Non-material amendment to adjust the location of plots on field 470.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application was for non-substantial amendment to previously approved plans. She explained that the changes involved the location and angle of the five static unit plots which were to be located in field 470. She noted that the concrete slabs for creating the plots had started to be built, which was in accordance with the plans submitted as part of the current planning application, and not what had been approved on application C15/0495/43/LL.

She noted that the layout of the plots were further away from the existing caravan site but there would not be a different substantial visible impact although it could be better if the development was in accordance with the original planning permission. She added that the application was reasonable and it would manage the situation; therefore it was recommended to approve the application with conditions.

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

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

- That it appeared that the change to the location and angle of the plots was in order to locate more plots on the land. That the applicant should comply with the rest of the conditions of planning application number C15/0495/43/LL before submitting another application;
- That there was a need to consider the proposal submitted, the proposal would not have an impact.

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

- An applicant could not be prevented from submitting an application and applications were determined on their own merits. The application submitted was seeking to change the location and angle of five static units and that consideration needed to be given to the impact of the change, compared to what had been approved already. Different actions to what had been approved under planning application number C15/0495/43/LL, had emerged when holding discussions with the applicant and the agent on the site and that the situation had been rectified by submitting this application.
- It was not possible to presume, and any application had to be dealt with on its own merits.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. In accordance with the plans
2. Need to comply with the remaining conditions on planning permission C15/0495/43/LL.

The meeting commenced at 1.00pm and concluded at 1.55pm.

**CHAIR**