

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 27.07.15

---

**Present:** Councillor Michael Sol Owen - Chair  
Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones – Vice-chair

**Councillors:** Stephen Churchman (Substitute), Endaf Cooke, Elwyn Edwards, Gwen Griffith, W. Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Others invited:** Councillors Sian Gwenllian and Elfed Wyn Williams (Local Members).

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Rhys Roberts (Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Development Control Senior Engineer), Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Services) and Glynda O'Brien (Member Support and Scrutiny Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillors June Marshall, Owain Williams and Dilwyn Lloyd (Substitute).

### 1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

(a) Councillor Gruffydd Williams declared a personal interest in Item 5 on the agenda in the following applications for the reasons noted:

- Planning Application Number C15/0485/46/LL because he was friends with the individual who was building the glamping provision.
- Planning Application Number C15/0495/43/LL because he was the applicant's son.

The Member was of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and he withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the applications noted.

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

- Councillor Elfed Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C13/0611/18/AM);
- Councillor Siân Gwenllian (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C15/0416/20/AM)
- Councillor Eirwyn Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C15/0429/35/LL)

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

### 2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee held on 6 July, 2015, 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 aspects of the policies.

#### RESOLVED

#### 1. Application Number C13/0611/18/AM – Rhiwgoch, Clwt-y-bont, Caernarfon

An outline application for a residential development of 17 houses (including two affordable units), along with a new access.

(a) The Committee was reminded by the Senior Planning Service Manager that this application had been submitted to the Planning Committee on 02.03.15 and it was the Committee's intention to refuse the application contrary to the officers' recommendation on the basis of two reasons, namely, over-development and lack of a play area provision. In the opinion of the Senior Planning Service Manager, since there was a significant risk to the Council in respect of the decision to refuse the application contrary to officers' recommendation, the matter was referred to a cooling off period in accordance with the Committee's standing orders. The purpose of reporting back to the Committee was to highlight the planning policy issues, the possible risks and the possible options for the Committee before it reached a final decision on the application.

The background of the application was expanded upon and it was noted that this was an outline application to construct 17 two-storey houses including two affordable houses on a site to the south-west of Deiniolen/Clwt-y-bont on a plot of brownfield land included within the development boundary of the village. The proposal also involved constructing a vehicular access to the adjoining class III county road. Previously, the International Safety Components factory was located on the site, but by now, the site had been cleared of the former climbing goods production factory's structure. At present, the front of the site was used as an informal parking space.

A previous application for 17 houses (including two affordable houses) was approved in July, 2010 with a Section 106 agreement to bind two of the 17 houses as affordable houses. However, no reserved details application was submitted within the statutory period and the permission had now lapsed.

Attention was drawn to the concerns highlighted by the Committee regarding refusing the application based on over-development, the provision of a play area and affordable houses. It was further explained that from the perspective of over-development, there was no increase in the number of houses proposed in this latest application compared with the application approved in 2010. It was explained that the relevant policy expressed that developments of up to 30 houses per hectare of land could be approved and the application before the committee sought 17 houses with a density of 24 houses per hectare. Therefore, it was noted that the density was less than stipulated in the planning policy. To respond to the concern regarding the danger for children walking to nearby playing fields because of the lack of a pavement along the road, the applicant had amended the site plan to include a provision of a play area in the north-eastern corner of the application site to create a safe play area for the children. The estimated sale/market values of the houses had been submitted and it was considered that the prices were affordable compared with the average house price figures in Deiniolen/Clwt y Bont.

Reference was made to the relevant planning policies.

The risks to the Council of refusing the application were elaborated upon and the options for the Committee should the application be refused were outlined and it was emphasised that they were substantial risks which included financial risks for the Council. To ensure that the Council avoided these risks, the planning officers recommended approving the application subject to completing a 106 agreement to ensure that two of the houses were affordable houses and in accordance with relevant planning conditions, to include a condition involving the maintenance work on the play area in future and the provision of play equipment.

(b) The Local Member noted his objection to the development because:

- The proposed area earmarked to create a play area was unsuitable as there was a difference in ground level and there was a need to ensure more than a piece of land, such as a financial contribution for play equipment via a 106 agreement which had been undertaken in several other places.
- The report referred to an empty site but in the Member's opinion, this was incorrect as it was used as a safe compound for building equipment.
- In terms of the average house prices in Deiniolen, it was found on the Internet that six out of eight houses in Deiniolen/Clwt y Bont were for sale for less than £100,000.
- In point 3.4 of the report, reference was made to Planning Policy Wales, which noted the need for affordable housing to integrate with the existing pattern but it was noted that this site was separate and there were other individual detached houses nearby but not an estate as proposed and it would be more intrusive than any other houses nearby.
- It was not agreed that clear evidence had been submitted to support the application and, therefore it did not conform to the policies.
- The response of the Planning Policy Unit was superficial in terms of policy A2 of the GUDP because without evidence how could the language statement be assessed.
- In point 3.25, it was noted that robust evidence had to be submitted to overturn officers' recommendation but the Member was of the opinion that there was insufficient robust evidence before the committee to justify the need for the houses.
- In point 4.1, reference was made that re-using a site was supported and also the construction of houses within the boundary but the Member was of the opinion that every site was not suitable in every case and every application had to be considered on its merits.
- Examples of empty houses across the ward were listed – those being constructed, permissions approved and applications to be submitted in the future.
- There were concerns regarding the condition of the road in front of the development and should the application be approved this would mean an increase in traffic on the road.

(c) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that:

- Two reasons had been given by the Planning Committee on 2 March 2015, for refusing the application, namely, over-development and lack of a play area provision.
- The matters involving the need and the language assessment had already been discussed in detail.
- It was an outline application that was before the committee and condition Number 8 in the report would address the need to agree on the details in terms of what was being proposed as part of the open space.

(ch) The Development Control Senior Engineer added that in terms of the roads network that the condition of the road was irrelevant in terms of the decision to approve the application.

He was of the opinion that the location of the proposed development was advantageous from the perspective of public transport.

(d) It was proposed and seconded that the application be approved in accordance with the officers' recommendation.

(dd) During the ensuing discussion the following points were made by individual Members:

- Concern regarding the lack of information on language and community issues and they should be a central part of applications
- Concern regarding the safety of the public walking along the road as it would not be possible to construct a pavement along the road
- The permission granted in 2010 was not relevant
- Whilst sympathising with the Local Member, it would be difficult to refuse the application because the land was within the development boundary of the village and complied with all planning policies and the only concern foreseen was the suitability of the play area and emphasis should be placed on the need to have play equipment and not to leave it as an open space.

(e) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that:

- A language statement had been submitted with the application; its contents had received full consideration by the Joint Planning Policy Unit and the response of the Joint Planning Policy Unit had been included in the report to the Planning Committee. This information was available on the Council Website. In addition, full information involving the application was on the file which was available to Members to see prior to and/or during the Planning Committee. If it was not possible for Members to have access to the Internet, appropriate officers of the Planning Unit would be more than willing to assist and/or send a link to the correct address.
- Details regarding safety would be included as part of the full application
- The permission granted in 2010 by the Arfon Planning Committee was relevant because it was part of the planning history of the application and this should be given consideration
- The applicant had offered to provide a play area and this could be secured by means of an additional condition and more detailed information would be received when the full application was submitted for consideration. It was emphasised that a request could not be made for more details with this application because it was an outline application to agree in principle to the provision of a play area.

(f) An amendment to defer making a decision on the application was proposed and seconded so that Members could receive information regarding the language assessment.

(ff) The Head of Legal Services reminded members that the Planning Committee had refused the application at its meeting on 2 March 2015, based on two reasons only, namely, an over-development and the provision of a play area and the application had not been refused on the basis of the lack of a language assessment. It was added that if the application was deferred, exactly the same report would be submitted at the next meeting of the Planning Committee.

A vote was taken on the amendment to postpone making a decision on the application and the vote was carried.

**Resolved: To defer making a decision on the application so that Members can receive information regarding the language assessment.**

## 2. Application Number C15/0377/22/LL – Bryn Lllys, Nebo, Caernarfon.

A full application to retain work to extend a dwelling without compliance with permission No. C13/0944/22/LL.

(a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background to the application and noted that the current application showed an extension of a similar design to the plan approved in 2014, and the external design reflected the position of the door and window openings similar to the previous permission but the extension was higher by approximately 1.0m and the length of the extension (including the lean-to extension), was approximately 2m longer than the extension approved previously. It was noted that the proposed external walls of the extension were covered with substantial field stones and that this added to the finished size of the extension. This application, as with the previous approval, included demolishing the two-storey section of the existing cottage and building a single-storey extension in the southern corner of the cottage.

Reference was made to the relevant policies together with public consultations.

The amended application was submitted to the Council as a result of the Enforcement Unit receiving a complaint that the work of building the extension did not conform to the planning approval. Following an inspection of the site and the approved plans, it became clear that the building work was not entirely in accordance with the approved plans and following a discussion with the owner a retrospective application was submitted to the Council for consideration.

It was emphasised that the principle of constructing an extension to the cottage had been established because the planning application approved in 2014 was extant until 2019. Although the size of the extension which was the subject of the current application was larger than the originally approved extension, it was not considered that the difference was sufficient to justify refusing the application.

Attention was given to additional observations received and it was noted that a building had been constructed on the land but following a discussion with the owner it was understood that it was only temporary to facilitate work on the house.

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

- As the owner of a property adjacent to the development, he was concerned about the height of the proposed building because it was much higher than what was seen in the surrounding area.
- It contradicted the Council's Design Guidelines in terms of the section on extending and adaptations which stated that an extension should not exceed the original building. In general, it was better that they were of a smaller size with lower ridge lines and that any type of extension was complementary to the original building and similarly equal to the pitch and height of the roof.
- A section of the development field had been included in the register of fields with landscapes of Outstanding Historic Interest in Wales.
- The development which had not been approved was basically different to the plan approved and therefore there was doubt whether the unauthorised development had been the subject of a full planning application under Section 17 of the Town and Country Planning Act
- The building had already established a precedent by virtue of the extension and the lack of compliance with building and design documents noted by the Council and any further deviation from the planning permission was inappropriate

- We live in an area of outstanding beauty and we are guardians of the land and it was understood that buildings had to be constructed for the benefit of the community. However, in this case it was not for the benefit of the community and the implications would extend to other applications for buildings in areas of natural beauty.

(c) Taking advantage of the opportunity to speak, the applicant's representative noted:

- The plans were submitted urgently for consideration for permission and the builder drew attention to the need for the cavity wall to measure 100mm with 300mm stones and this was the reason for the increase in the length of the extension.
- The increase in height was as a consequence of the steel work and the size of the beams as a result of the design
- In terms of impact, it was felt that the proposed building would not have any impact on nearby properties considering that the extension had been approved and the only issue under consideration was the additional 2m in length and 1m in height.
- It could not be reduced in height and at the same time it complied with planning policies and it was not felt that it would have any impact on neighbours as it was 170 metres away from any property.

(ch) The officers' recommendation was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

(d) The following observations were made:

- Care had to be taken that approving the application would not create a precedent to approve other developments that did not comply with approved plans and it was noted that it was important for the Enforcement Officer of the Planning Unit to ensure that the proposed extension complied with the permission in terms of length and height.
- A Member sympathised with the objector and found it difficult to understand how the agent/applicant could be unaware of the planning regulations/policies and consequently she would be abstaining from voting on the proposal to approve the application as she was of the opinion that it was unfair
- If this had been a new application and included the current measurements would the planning officers approve it?

(dd) In response to the above, the Development Control Manager explained that what was before the committee was an assessment of the additional size and it was not materially different from the previous permission and, therefore, it was the officers' recommendation to support the application.

The vote on the proposal to approve was carried and two members abstained from voting.

**Resolved: To approve in accordance with the following conditions:**

- 1. Construct the extension in accordance with the approved plans.**
- 2. Install slates on the roof.**
- 3. Cover the building's external walls with field stones.**
- 4. Landscaping plan.**
- 5. The adjacent public footpath must be kept clear of any obstacles during the construction period and subsequently.**

### **3. Application Number C15/0416/20/AM – Land at Beach Road, Y Felinheli**

An outline application with some reserved matters for constructing 14 dwellings together with the construction of an access and estate road, provision of allotments and associated access and parking.

(a) The Development Control Senior Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that this was an outline application to construct 14 houses, create a vehicular access and estate road along with provision of allotments and associated access and parking with some reserved matters to be included within a detailed application (should this outline application be approved). The only matter that formed part of this outline application was the proposed access and the reserved matters relating to landscaping, elevations, layout and scale.

The main elements of the application were noted, namely:

- The provision of houses to include eight bungalows, four dormer houses and two two-storey houses and with a semi-detached layout with four of the houses proposed as affordable houses
- Creating five allotments and associated parking spaces on the lower part of the site
- Creating a new access – to serve the houses there would be a need to create a new access from the unclassified county road (Beach Road). To be able to create the access and secure standard visibility and create a new footpath, the *clawdd* that separated the site from the county road would have to be demolished along the site's northern boundary.

The relevant policies were elaborated upon and considering the context of the local policies and guidelines, it was clear that the proposal was not acceptable in principle and it was contrary to local policies and guidelines along with the advice included in the Welsh Government's documents relating to location, visual amenities, and impact on sites of archaeological importance, biodiversity and wildlife.

Considering all the assessments, it was the planning officers' recommendation to refuse the application because it was unacceptable on the grounds of the principle of developing houses in the location in question, impact on the listed ancient monument, impact on visual amenities, impact on road safety and loss of a '*clawdd*' and a hedge.

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

- An appeal was made to the Committee to defer making a determination on the application
- The application site was adjacent to the development boundary of Felinheli as outlined in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan.
- The application proposed 14 houses, four of which were affordable which equated to 30% of the total
- There was a wide range of facilities and services in Felinheli and it was considered that these were sufficient to support the growth in the population that would be derived from the proposed development
- 64.3% of the population of the Felinheli Ward spoke Welsh compared with 65.4% in Gwynedd.
- The variety of houses that were proposed was likely to attract single people, older families and families with children and the development could have a positive effect on the local primary school by increasing the number of pupils
- The number of incomers in the Felinheli Ward had increased from 191 to 280 – 46.6% between 1991 and 2001, which compared with the increase in Gwynedd of 47.5%
- There was only a decrease of 2.6 Welsh speakers between 2001 – 2011 which meant that the incomers were not non-Welsh speakers.

- The proposal was very attractive in terms of attracting people to live there because of the facilities available in Felinheli as well as its proximity to Bangor and Caernarfon
- With Bangor and Caernarfon being important employment centres, the development would facilitate the proximity of people to local services and places of employment
- The percentage of holiday homes was fairly low in Felinheli compared with the County percentage which meant that the possibility of using the proposed housing to this end was fairly low.

(c) The following points were made by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee):

- Felinheli Community Council had expressed its objection to the proposed development for several reasons, including that the site was outside the development boundary as noted in the report of the planning officers
- As this was an outline application which was before the committee, there was uncertainty what type of houses were intended on the site and, therefore, an appeal was made to the Committee not to defer the application and refuse it because there was no demand for open market housing in Felinheli at present
- Some developments which had already been completed and/or had planning permissions to construct them in the future in Felinheli were listed
- The proposed development would create an increase in traffic and create traffic jams in the centre of the village and there would be a need to widen the road to create a footway to make the site safe.
- Reference was made to flooding problems along with biodiversity issues
- As a consequence of the lack of local need for housing, this could lead in turn to an impact on the Welsh language because Felinheli was one of the communities where there was a reduction of approximately 8% in Welsh speakers since the last Census and, therefore, the language assessment submitted by the developer cannot be accepted.

(ch) In response to the above observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that there was no justification in deferring the application mainly because the site was outside to the development boundary together with environmental concerns.

(d) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the planning officers' recommendation.

(dd) In response to an enquiry by a Member, it was explained that the opinion of the Joint Planning Policy Unit in point 5.16 had been made as a result of an assessment submitted and this did not mean that the Unit supported the application but rather that the information addressed issues in terms of relevant planning considerations involving language and community issues.

**Resolved: To refuse for the following reasons:-**

**1. The proposal is unacceptable in principle and it is contrary to the requirements of Policies C1, CH7 and CH9 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan and the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing and Building New Houses in the Countryside, Technical Advice Note 2 which deals with Affordable Housing, Technical Advice Note on Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities, along with Planning Policy Wales Chapter 9 on Housing as it would mean constructing new houses in open countryside without justification.**



2. The proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policies B23 and C1 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, Supplementary Planning Guidance on Building New Houses in the Countryside, Gwynedd Design Guidance, and Technical Advice Note 12 on Design, along with Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 9 on Housing, as the proposal would mean creating an incompatible feature in a sensitive landscape.

3. The proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policy B7 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 6 and Welsh Office Circular 60/96 as the proposal will have a severe detrimental effect on the setting and integrity of the registered ancient monument known as the Dinas Promontory Fort.

4. The proposal to demolish the existing 'clawdd' and hedge is contrary to the requirements of Policies A1 and B21 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, Technical Advice Note 5 on Planning and Nature Conservation and Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 5 on Protecting and Enhancing the Natural Heritage and the Coast, as no ecological assessment has been submitted with the application which would enable the Local Planning Authority to assess in detail the ecological impacts of the important development which greatly contributes to the character of the amenities of the area.

5. The proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policies A1 and CH33 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, Technical Advice Note 18 on Transport and Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 8 on Transport as there is insufficient information based on a traffic assessment submitted with the application which shows that the local roads network is able to cope with the increase in traffic that will be derived from the development.

#### 4. Application No. C15/0429/35/LL – Llwyn Madyn, Muriau, Cricieth

A full application for a first floor extension including raising the roof level, creating a balcony and changes to fenestration (re-submission following the refusal of planning permission C14/1152/35/LL).

(a) The Planning Control Officer elaborated on the background to the application and stated that it was a re-submission of a previous application which had been refused in January of this year on the ground of delegated rights. The proposal involved extending an existing dormer bungalow to create a substantial two-storey dwelling in its place. The roof level of the main house would be raised from 6m to 8m whilst the roof level of the existing single-storey extension would be raised from 4.2m to 6.7m. The building would have slate pitched roofs and painted rendered walls.

Whilst there was no objection to the standard of the design or the materials, it was important to consider the location of the proposal as it was located in a housing estate with consistent designs, namely, either single-storey or one and a half-storey dormer bungalows. The building after extending it would be a substantial building which would be completely different to surrounding properties and it would be considered an incompatible feature in the townscape and in this part of Cricieth. The policies of the Development Plan noted that new developments had to respect their site and locality in terms of scale, size and form of the development and in this case, it was not considered that the proposal complied with this.

The house was located in a substantial curtilage and it was agreed that it would be completely possible to construct an extension to the house within the curtilage without substantial harm to the character and visual amenities of the area. However, it was not agreed that the design proposed was appropriate for the site. Therefore, it was considered that the design was completely unsuitable for this site and contrary to relevant planning policies. Approving this proposal could mean setting a precedent which could change the

character of the estate completely. Having considered all the considerations, it was recommended that the Committee refuse the application for the reasons listed in the planning officers' report.

It was noted further that a late application had been submitted by the applicant to show pictures of sections of the estate but it was noted that what had been submitted in the form of slides by the Planning Department clearly reflected the context of the site to the Committee.

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

- He was unhappy that he had not been allowed to submit pictures to the Committee as the pictures of the Planning Department did not show that there were two houses already on the estate
- Two houses on the estate had been built in the 50s and they were two-storeys with four bedrooms
- The extension meant raising the level by only 2m
- No objections had been received from neighbours
- In terms of consistency, there were all types of different houses on the estate and nothing out of the ordinary was requested
- Many houses had been constructed in Cricieth recently which were far worse than what was sought here and in the applicant's opinion it was not an over-development.

(c) The Local Member (who was a member of this Planning Committee), stated that he was unhappy that it had not been possible to submit the applicant's photographs and that he was supportive of the application before the Committee. He noted further that there had been no objections from the following consultees:

- Cricieth Town Council
- Residents of Cricieth
- Neighbours
- The Council's Transportation Unit

Reference was made to policy B22 which noted that the site was located in a prominent location on a junction between two public roads. It was felt that this was misleading as the road was unclassified and without a pavement and it was an internal road used by residents of the estate only.

(ch) It was proposed and seconded that the Planning Committee should visit the site.

**Resolved: to ask the Planning Committee to visit the site.**

## **5. Application No. C15/0460/15/LL – Bryn Padarn, 19 Rallt Goch, Llanberis.**

Full application for the erection of a new dwelling in the form of a three bedroom dormer bungalow, creation of a new vehicular access and associated works.

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background to the application and noted that the site was located within the development boundaries of the village of Llanberis and was part of the curtilage of an existing domestic property and it was on land which projected quite a considerable distance to the front of this property and on a higher level than the adjoining public highway and there were rocky outcrops in places.

It was acknowledged that the design of this building was contemporary within this local area compared with other buildings. Despite this, it was not believed that there was one definite

pattern to the built form of the area. Forming an opinion about what makes a good design is a subjective matter and, in this case, it was not believed that it would have an unacceptable effect on any existing definite form.

Therefore, it was believed that the proposal in terms of its design and finish is acceptable in this case and that, based on these matters; it would not have a detrimental effect on the visual amenities of the local area to an unacceptable level. It was therefore considered that the proposal complied with the requirements of policies B22 and B25 of the UDP.

In terms of general and residential amenities, it was noted that the site was higher than adjacent roads and therefore constructing a building on this land looking from the direction of these roads, would be prominent within the local landscape. Despite this, the built-up pattern of the local area included houses on elevated sites and therefore it would not be unique in that sense.

It was noted that the design of the property had considered the effect of overlooking on neighbouring residents. The most prominent glass element was at the front of the building looking over an existing fairly open space and therefore it was not believed that there would be obvious over-looking caused by these elevations. The dense built-up form of the existing area meant that over-looking would be unavoidable to some degree, but it was seen in this case that a genuine attempt had been made to avoid excessive over-looking as a result of erecting this building in the proposed form.

Concerns were raised regarding the proposal in terms of its detrimental impact on the local roads network and its users. It was noted that there was an existing vehicular access to the site which provided parking spaces for the existing property. This access would be modified to ensure a suitable access and the parking provision for the existing property would be moved to another part of their curtilage.

The Transportation Unit did not have any objection to the proposal, and suggested including standard conditions with the development. Consequently, it was not believed that the proposal would be unacceptable in terms of highway matters and, therefore, it complied with the requirements of policies CH33 and CH36 of the GUDP.

Having considered the above and all the relevant matters including the local and national policies and guidance, and all the observations received, it was not believed that this application to erect one property was unacceptable and that it complied with the requirements of all the relevant policies as noted above and it was recommended that it should be approved.

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

**Resolved: To approve – with conditions**

1. **Time**
2. **Comply with plans**
3. **Materials**
4. **Slate**
5. **Highways including a condition to ensure that parking spaces are provided for existing properties before commencing any works.**
6. **Welsh Water conditions**
7. **Landscaping**
8. **Natural Resources Wales Advice**
9. **Removal of Permitted General Development Rights including not installing any new windows without seeking prior permission.**
10. **Note on Party Wall Act**

## 6. Application No. C15/0485/46/LL – Land near Tŷ Bwlcyn, Dinas, Pwllheli

A full application to install 5 glamping pods and construction of kitchen/toilet facilities block along with a car park and change of use of lake from agricultural to tourism.

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background to the application, noting that it involved installing five 'glamping' pods and a compost toilet along with the construction of a kitchen/toilets facilities block and a parking provision on land in Tŷ Bwlcyn, Dinas. It was also requested to change the use of the existing agricultural lake to tourist use so that visitors to the site could use it for fishing and leisure. The pods would be of timber construction and installed on a field to the north-east of the lake and located around the wooded boundaries of the field. The building and the car park would be located at the bottom of a slope in close proximity to holiday cottages in the ownership of Tŷ Bwlcyn and it was proposed to improve the existing footpath to link the parking with the field where the pods were located. It was proposed to connect to the existing septic tank which was on the site.

The site was situated in open countryside and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It was proposed to re-establish the existing unused access to the unclassified road as an entrance to the development and it would be widened and the visibility would be improved.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was noted that Policy D19 permitted proposals to develop new touring caravan sites and camping sites and new touring units provided they conformed to all of the noted criteria. Amongst them was the need that the design, lay-out and appearance of the development should be of a high standard and that it was located in an unobtrusive location.

Applications for pods were considered under the touring caravans policy as they were mobile/camping units to all intents and purposes. They would be mobile units and it would be possible to move them comparatively easily around the field. It was believed that the field in question would be suitable for such a development as there was higher ground to the rear and a thick layer of vegetation around the boundaries which meant that they would be concealed and out of sight of the public and the nearest houses. It was not foreseen that there would be a substantial increase in traffic as a consequence of the application, considering the small scale of the proposal and it was likely that the traffic would be restricted to cars and bicycles, rather than towing vehicles as would be usual for touring caravan sites. As the aim was to re-establish the existing access to an unclassified road, planning permission was not required and it could be improved without causing significant harm to landscape features. It was considered that the proposal complied with criterion 2 of policy D19 of the GUDP.

It was proposed to locate the pods in the field for the holiday season only and the applicant noted that it was proposed to remove them either to a concealed corner of the field or to the car park over the winter.

Having weighed up the proposal against the relevant policies, it was considered that the principle of establishing a five pod 'glamping' site, erecting a facilities building and associated work was acceptable in this unobtrusive site. It was considered that the proposal complied with the policies discussed above, and was therefore acceptable to be approved with relevant planning conditions.

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

(c) During the discussion the following main points were noted:

- the Government encouraged such facilities and it was to be welcomed in Gwynedd but disappointment was expressed that the provision was considered under the policy of touring caravans and should not a unique policy be established for 'glamping' provision because the pods were not moveable
- such a provision blended into the landscape better than caravans but there was concern in terms of the current application before the committee regarding the safety of children in terms of use of the lake

(ch) In response to the above observations, the Development Control Manager explained that:

- in terms of the policy, the provision was considered as comparative to touring caravans but it could also include a tepee provision
- it was noted that relevant policy consideration had been established as the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Holiday Accommodation had been adopted by the Council and dealt with 'glamping'
- The safety of the users would be the responsibility of the site operator

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

1. **Commence within five years**
2. **In accordance with submitted plans**
3. **Five pods only to be sited in the places shown only unless they are stored**
4. **Restricted to a specific holiday period - 1 March – 31 October and then they must be removed to the agreed storage area**
5. **Holiday units only and a register must be kept**
6. **The storage location must be agreed prior to commencing any part of the permitted development**
7. **The roof of the building to be of a grey colour**
8. **Finish of the building to be agreed**
9. **Landscaping**
10. **Road conditions**
11. **The lake to be used for the residents of the pods /holiday cottages only and not open to the public or for any other business use.**

**Note: Licence**

**7. Application number C15/0495/43/LL – Gwynus Caravan Park and Golf Course, Pistyll, Pwllheli**

A full application to upgrade 10 existing static caravans and relocate five to field 471 and the other five to field 470. Extend the caravan site to part of field 470, reduce the number of touring caravans from 55 to 52, relocate touring caravans from field 471 to field 472, increase the storage area for 40 touring caravans over the winter months on field 472. Erect a new reception on the site of the pig-sties in accordance with the extant permission.

(a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application noting that there had been discussions with the applicant's agent regarding the proposal. As part of the upgrading, the number of touring caravans on the site as a whole would be reduced from 55 to 52. The proposal would also be a means of regulating the siting of nine touring caravans on field 4942.

There was currently permission to site a total of 10 static and 55 touring caravans on the site. Permission also existed for the storage of 40 touring caravans on the northern section of field 472 during the winter months. At present, there was planning permission to use field

470 as a golf course and the site was located in the countryside and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was noted that Policy D17 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan approved proposals for upgrading existing static caravan sites, including minor extensions to the land area, relocating units or for a minor increase in numbers and exchanging touring spaces for static holiday caravan units provided it complied with the three relevant criteria.

It was also explained that the application included a proposal to extend the touring caravan winter storage area to field 472 entirely. It was not proposed to increase the number of touring caravans that would be stored. A section of field 472 into which it was proposed to extend the storage site had vegetation growth surrounding it and it was not considered that the site would be intrusive in the landscape. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of Policy D21 of the GUDP.

It was noted also that the AONB Unit had stated that the development would be visible from the road between Pistyll and Pentreuchaf. Although it was agreed that a glimpse of the site could be seen from parts of this road, as a result of the planting that had been undertaken over the years, and the location of the site which would be extended to the north of the boundary of the existing caravan site, it was not considered that the proposal would be seen clearly from the road between Pistyll and Pentreuchaf or from other roads in the locality. As a consequence of the above, the current situation and what the application proposed, it was not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the AONB; hence, it was acceptable in terms of Policy B8 of the GUDP.

The site was also within the Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Historic Interest. However, it was not considered that the proposal would be contrary to Policy B12 of the GUDP since it would not be a development on such a large scale as to have a greater than local impact on the historic landscape.

It was considered that the proposal would improve the setting of the site and would enable locating the touring units in one section of the site rather than in its current form which was more dispersed. This application had also submitted a detailed plan of how the lay-out of the site would appear and having one permission for the site would be simpler and easier to control than the fragmented permissions that had received permissions over the years. The proposal would be implemented in phases which would ensure that no obvious modifications would be seen overnight and would be a means of ensuring that the development would be undertaken in an orderly manner and ensuring adherence to the number of caravans permitted.

- (b) It was proposed, seconded and voted unanimously to approve the application.
- (c) In response to an enquiry by a Member regarding responsibility for the passing-place, the Development Control Senior Engineer explained that the road to the site had been partly adopted but further work had to be undertaken in the passing-place (namely tarmacking), as part of the previous application, before the Council could adopt it.

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

- 1. Five years**
- 2. In accordance with the plans**
- 3. The upgrading work to be completed in accordance with the six phase development that was submitted as part of the application and one phase of the upgrading work to be completed prior to proceeding to the next phase.**
- 4. A total of 10 static units only**

5. **A total of 52 touring units only.**
6. **Static caravan holiday season.**
7. **Touring caravan holiday season.**
8. **Holiday use only – static and touring caravans.**
9. **Maintain a register of users.**
10. **Agree on the colour of the new static units and those that will be exchanged in future.**
11. **The passing places on the track up to the site to be constructed to the adopted standard before the relocated static caravans are occupied.**
12. **The temporary track which will be created to access field 470 is to be eliminated and the land restored to its current condition prior to commencing on the fourth phase of the development.**
13. **Following the elimination of the temporary road in accordance with condition 13 above the access to the units located on field 470 will be via field 471 only.**
14. **Pigsties to be recorded by photographic record and a copy to be deposited to the Local Planning Authority and the Royal Commission on the Ancient and Historic Monuments of Wales prior to demolition.**
15. **Welsh slate on the roof of the new reception building.**
16. **New timber-framed windows and doors on the new reception building.**
17. **The rainwater goods of the new reception building to be made of aluminium.**
18. **Western and southern elevations of the new reception building to be finished in stone to be re-used from the existing pigsties.**
19. **To restrict the use of the new reception building exclusively for uses associated with the caravan site.**
20. **Landscaping.**
21. **No storing of boats on the land.**
22. **Maximum of 40 touring caravans to be stored over the winter months in field number 472.**
23. **The touring caravans that are in storage must be kept within 1 metre of each other.**
24. **Any light that is to be installed in the porch of the new building to work either on a timer or to be movement sensitive.**

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 3.10 pm.