

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 24/3/14

---

**Present:**        **Councillor Gwen Griffith – Chair**  
                       **Councillor Michael Sol Owen – Vice-chair**

**Councillors:** Elwyn Edwards, Anne Lloyd Jones, June Marshall, Dafydd Meurig, William Tudor Owen, Eirwyn Williams, Hefin Williams, Owain Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Others invited:** Councillors Edward T. Dogan, Eric Merfyn Jones, John Wynn Jones, Siân Gwenllïan and Simon Glyn (Local members).

**Also present:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), Rhun ap Iarll (Senior Solicitor), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Officer – Transport), Glyn Llewelyn Gruffudd (Senior Development Control Officer) and Lowri Haf Evans (Member Support and Scrutiny Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillors Dyfrig Wynn Jones, Louise Hughes and John Pughe Roberts. Councillor Elwyn Edwards apologised for his absence from the visits to St Mary's site and the former Ysgol Glanadda site, Bangor which were held on the morning of this Planning Committee.

### 1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

(a) The following member declared a personal interest for the reasons noted:

- Councillor Owain Williams in item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C13/1239/42/LL) as he was the joint-owner of a nearby caravan park.

The member left the Chamber during the discussion on the application in question and he did not vote on the matter.

### 2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee held on 3 March 2014, 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.

#### 1. Application no. C13/0223/46/LL – Old Coal Yard Site, Llaniestyn.

**Demolish an existing steel frame building and erect a new building to accommodate two self-serviced holiday units**

Members of the Committee had visited the site before the meeting.

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the background of the application to demolish the former building of the Llaniestyn coal yard and erect a new building in its place to accommodate two self-serviced holiday units. The current building stood in the centre of the historical village of Llaniestyn, which had been designated a Rural Village. The site bordered with the Llaniestyn Conservation Area and was contained in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Thorough consideration had been given to the design of the development and its setting in the village. The proposal in its amended form was

unlikely to have a significant detrimental impact on the AONB landscape, therefore it was not considered to be contrary to policy B8. It could be argued that such a building provided a visual improvement within a sensitive location.

She noted that the Council's policies in relation to constructing new holiday units approved proposals for units on suitable previously developed land; therefore the principle of the proposal was considered acceptable. Proposals which gave priority to reusing previously developed land or buildings (in this case the Old Coal Yard) were also approved, provided the site/building was suitable (policy C3).

While the points raised by the objectors regarding their use as holiday units were appreciated, the applicants did not wish to change the application to include one affordable unit. It was considered that the proposal of constructing a building to accommodate two holiday units was acceptable and complied with the policies of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan.

- (b) It was noted that the following additional information/observations had been received:-

*Conservation Officer's Observations*

*The site is located near the boundary of the Llaniestyn Conservation Area and there are two listed buildings nearby. It is not considered that the proposal would have any adverse effect on the character of the Conservation Area nor on the listed buildings as there is sufficient distance separating the site, together with existing trees and mature landscaping.*

- (c) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted that he did not object to the application, but that he was:
- dubious of the success of holiday units in Llaniestyn
  - keen to have better control of holiday unit registrations and the need to monitor the use of the development. He proposed that an additional condition should be imposed on the application that the owner of the holiday units registers the development and submits details to the Council every quarter showing that the properties are restricted to holiday use only.
- (ch) In response to a question, the Development Control Manager noted that no response had been received from the AONB Unit following amendments to the design / plan.

It was proposed, seconded and voted to approve the application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the following conditions:**

1. Time
2. Comply with amended plans dated 16 December 2013
3. Slates to be agreed
4. Materials to be agreed
5. Window with opaque glass to be installed on the first floor western elevation
6. Holiday use only/keep a record
7. Landscaping
8. Create parking provision prior to the units being occupied
9. Welsh Water conditions
10. Withdrawal of general permitted development rights.

**2. Application no. C13/1232/46/LL – Tŷ Isaf, Tudweiliog.**

**A retrospective application for a touring caravan site with 15 pitches and the conversion of outbuildings to toilets/showers.**

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the background of the (retrospective) application for siting 15 (new) touring caravans and retaining existing buildings that had been converted into toilets/showers. The site was located on the outskirts of the development boundary of Tudweiliog village and within a Landscape Conservation Area (LCA).

She noted that policy D19 permitted proposals to develop new touring caravan and touring unit sites provided they complied with all the criteria. Policy C4 was supportive of proposals to adapt buildings to be reused. Therefore, it was considered that the principle of using the existing buildings on the site as showers, toilets etc. was acceptable.

Due to the scale of the application and its location together with its existing natural features, it was not considered that the site was obtrusive in the landscape, or that it was likely to have a significant harmful impact on the visual amenities of the LCA. There were three dwellings located immediately near the eastern boundary of the site. There was an earthen bank with a hedgerow on top along this boundary which would assist in ensuring reasonable privacy for users of the nearby houses. It was not considered that a site with 15 touring caravans would be an overdevelopment of the site and would not lead to additional traffic to an extent that would significantly harm local amenities (policy B23).

- (b) It was noted that the following additional information/observations had been received:-

*One item of correspondence had been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:-*

- *Effect on noise level in the centre of the village and where houses were located very close to the site.*
- *Affecting privacy.*
- *Causing social problems.*
- *An increasing number of caravans in the area, and it was not considered that a small village like Tudweiliog could accommodate such numbers.*
- *Increase in traffic.*
- *No objection if the applicant chose a different field on the farm which was further from the centre of the village and nearby houses.*

*The response of the Joint Policy Unit to the Language and Community Statement had been received. The observations stated that on the whole they did not believe the nature and scale of the proposed development were likely to have an adverse impact on the Welsh language, and stated that since the proposal was entirely for touring caravan pitches and not permanent pitches, it was unlikely that the development would have a significant impact on inward migration into the area.*

- (c) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following point:

- The western hedgerow of the field was much lower than the eastern hedgerow, and separated the village from the field. He proposed an additional condition that the hedgerow should be reconstructed with new growth, and that the upper part of the field should not be used for caravans until the hedgerow had matured. Add to condition 6 that a discussion should be held with the applicant regarding appropriate landscaping.

It was proposed, seconded and voted to approve the application in accordance with the conditions (with emphasis on appropriate landscaping).

**RESOLVED to delegate the right to the Planning Manager to approve, subject to receiving the favourable observations of the Joint Policy Unit on the Language and Community Statement – and subject to the following conditions:**

1. In accordance with submitted plans.
2. The number of units on the site at any one time to be restricted to 15.
3. Conditions on the timeframe for siting caravans/holiday period/moving the caravans when not in use.
4. No storing on the land.
5. Records list.
6. Landscaping.
7. Welsh Water/sewerage conditions.

**3. Application no. C13/1239/42/LL – Fferm y Wern, Nefyn**

**Exchange 50 tents for 20 touring caravans and 25 tents together with new toilet block.**

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the application which involved exchanging 50 tents, which had been approved through a lawful use certificate in the 1970s, for 20 touring caravans and 25 tents. It was also proposed to erect a toilet block and install a new septic tank, along with additional landscaping and reinforcement of existing hedging.

The site had been operating as a camp site for years, with a lawful certificate for the use of two fields between April and October within any given year. The site was in a coastal location within the AONB. There was a static caravan site on the opposite side of the county road.

She drew attention to Policy D20 which permitted proposals to extend sites, install new pitches, relocate or exchange units on existing touring caravan and camping sites provided the proposal formed part of a plan that would secure environmental and visual improvements in terms of the location, layout, design and appearance of the site.

It was not proposed to undertake any changes to the existing single access. It was accepted that the access wasn't ideal, but the site had been operating as a camp site for years. As the Transportation Officer did not object to the proposal, the application was considered acceptable in respect of policies CH33 and CH36 of the GUDP.

It was believed that the proposal showed an effort to undertake environmental and visual improvements in respect of the location, setting, design and appearance in the landscape and that approving the application would mean that the site could be managed with relevant conditions. The application did not extend the site in any way; rather it only exchanged the units that had already been authorised.

- c) It was noted that the following additional observations / information had been received:-

*The response of Gwynedd Council's Health and Safety Officer  
The application is satisfactory, I have no observations.*

*The response of the Joint Policy Unit to the Language and Community Statement had been received. The observations stated that on the whole they did not believe the nature and scale of the proposed development were likely to have an adverse impact on the Welsh language. Since the proposal was entirely for touring caravan pitches and not permanent pitches, it was unlikely that the development would have a significant impact on inward migration into the area. As the proposal exchanged tent pitches for touring caravan pitches on an existing tourism accommodation site, it could be argued that the proposal was unlikely to have a significant effect on the area, including on the Welsh language.*

It was proposed, seconded and voted to approve the application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the following conditions:**

1. Commence within five years
2. Layout in accordance with the plans
3. Limit the number of units on the site at any given time
4. Conditions on the timeframe for siting caravans/holiday period/moving the caravans when not in use
5. No storing
6. Register
7. Erect the *cloddiau* and landscaping before siting any caravans on site
8. Slates to be agreed
9. Toilet block finishes to be agreed.

**4. Application no. C13/1301/11/LL – 319, High Street Bangor****An application to change the use of an empty shop with offices/storage above to a hot food takeaway premises with a five bedroom multiple-occupation house above.**

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application to change the use of an existing empty shop to a hot food takeaway use (use A3). He noted that the application had been revised following the receipt of additional information from the applicant – there was no intention to adapt the upper floors to a multiple occupation house.

It was noted that a substantial number of objections (based on competition) had been received. Commercial competition was not a material consideration for planning. There were similar businesses dotted around the area; however it was not considered that there was an unacceptable intensive concentration of this type of business within this particular area.

The proposal was an opportunity to make use of an empty unit on the high street where a number of empty units existed – it was an opportunity therefore to sustain the town's vitality. Consequently, it was considered that the application was acceptable and complied with the requirements of the relevant policies.

- (b) It was noted that the following additional information/observations had been received:-

*A letter had been received from the applicant in response to the City Council's objection to the application. He disagreed with the view regarding the hot food takeaway element and noted that he had given consideration to policy D25 and confirmed that:*

- *The use corresponded with nearby uses*
- *The premises would not create excessive noise, odours or litter that would have an adverse effect on the character of the area, and it merely gave customers another option as opposed to attracting more people to Bangor*
- *It would not lead to a concentration of this type of development in one particular area*

*He then stated that due to the observation regarding the change of use of the upper floors, he no longer intended to change them into a House in Multiple Occupation and would use them as a living unit for him and his family, therefore complying with policy CH15.*

- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted that:
- His intention was to bring an empty unit back into use which would improve the appearance of the street
  - Approving the application would create opportunities for local jobs for renovating the shop and then staffing it
  - There would be an additional choice of food for customers
  - It was unlikely to attract 'new people' as there were existing food shops there.
  - Consideration had been given to policy D25 (Hot Food Takeaway developments).

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application conditional on the business' opening hours. It was noted that there were already problems in Bangor which could be harmful to the amenities of local residents. A member proposed closing hours of no later than 1:30am.

The Chair of the Licensing Committee, although entitled to express his views and vote on the application, decided to withdraw from the chamber for the discussion and the vote.

In response to the proposal, the solicitor noted that the Council's internal arrangements stated that the Licensing Unit held the discussion regarding opening and closing times, although there was nothing preventing the Committee from proposing a condition regarding the times. The Senior Planning Service Manager noted that should the application be approved, it would be appropriate to hold a discussion with the Public Protection Department.

It was added that there was a need to ensure that everyone was treated equally (in this context, the opening hours of other businesses in the area), and if a condition relating to closing hours was imposed, evidence was required to support that condition.

**RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the following conditions:**

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Submit details of ventilation systems, litter arrangements and drain defences
4. Hold a further discussion with the Public Protection Department regarding opening hours.

**5. Application no. C14/0041/11/LL – NWS Dock Management Ltd, Port Dinorwic, Felinheli.**

**Change of use of existing offices to a restaurant together with installing an enclosed balcony extension at the front.**

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the background of the application to change the use of existing offices to a restaurant and erect an enclosed balcony extension at the front.

She explained that the site was located on the quayside in Felinheli – the building was substantial, three-storey at its highest. It was proposed to change the use of most of the building to a restaurant, whilst keeping three offices (one on each floor). The site was located within the development boundary of the village of Felinheli and therefore it was considered that the proposal complied with the requirements of policy C1 (Locating New Development).

Seven parking spaces (including two disabled) along with four bicycle spaces were provided on the application site, and there was additional parking for at least 31 vehicles within the applicant's ownership available in a convenient place nearby.

- (b) It was noted that the following additional information/observations had been received:-

*Additional observations had been received noting that the parking situation and the access to the site was terrible at present, and that the proposal would make the situation worse.*

- (c) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following points in support of the application:
- A very suitable development that would revitalise this area on the outskirts of the village
  - It would create work locally

- The balcony was a good addition to the building
- Concerns regarding parking, the applicant had plenty of additional parking area.

It was proposed, seconded and voted to approve the application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the following conditions:**

1. Commence the development within five years
2. Complete the development in accordance with the plans submitted
3. No increase in surface water
4. Grease trap scheme
5. Provision of parking spaces
6. Opening hours between 8am and 12am (midnight)
7. Agree to a noise and odour emission system

**6. Application no. C14/0035/11/LL – Site of St Mary’s College, Lôn Pobty, Bangor**

**A full application to redevelop the site for student accommodation by converting existing buildings, demolishing and erecting new buildings with associated facilities, together with associated works including creating an access, creating parking spaces, landscaping and creating an off-site parking area for residents.**

Members of the Committee had visited the site before the meeting.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the (full) application for planning permission to redevelop the site. The proposal was to create a residential campus for 602 students by demolishing some existing buildings, converting and renovating existing buildings, constructing new buildings, creating associated facilities, adapting the existing access, creating parking spaces, landscaping and creating a separate car park for local residents.

The site was located on the outskirts of the built boundary of the city of Bangor (outside the development boundary as shown on the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan). It was on an elevated location near the Lôn Pobty public road.

It was considered that the proposal made suitable use of brownfield land, namely the site of the existing St Mary’s buildings, and that it complied with the objectives of Policy CH39 which related to further education developments and which referred specifically to student residential accommodation.

The numerous plans that had been submitted with the application showed that the scale of the new buildings to be erected on the site varied in terms of form, with a maximum height of four floors for some of the new buildings. It was intended to position the new buildings so that their gable-ends faced the city. The aim of renewing what was already there would safeguard the visual effect.

The number of observations that had been received was very low bearing in mind the scale of the development. It was accepted that the roads serving the area were poor and narrow – there was no possibility of extending due to the nature of the surrounding land.

It was acknowledged that there were a number of matters to resolve, but that the proposal was acceptable. It was reported that an additional condition of using 90% of the demolition waste within the site itself was to be included with the proposal.

- (b) It was noted that the following additional information/observations had been received:-

*Trees Officer – The trees report submitted is acceptable but further agreement is needed on some specific aspects through formal conditions, such as:*

- *Tree preservation scheme*
- *Trees impact statement*
- *Monitoring programme*
- *Landscape and management scheme*

*Biodiversity Unit – Conditions need to be included relating to the period for clearing the site, tree preservation measures must be followed, and additional trees are needed along the southern boundary of the site. Further information was received regarding mitigation measures for protected species. The information is acceptable and we agree with the recommendations, the recommendations should be followed thoroughly. There is mention of the presence of invasive species on the site, we recommend including a condition to eradicate and control species on the site to be agreed with the authority before the site is developed.*

*Joint Planning Policy Unit – Reference is made to the variety of building use in the nearby area, it is seen that several residential units are used as private student accommodation and there are also purpose-built buildings for providing student accommodation. According to the university's student accommodation strategy, the numbers attending the university are likely to remain the same, namely just over 9,000, and there is room for around 2,400 students within the university's purpose-built student halls. According to this strategy, there is a need to provide up to 800 rooms from 2015-16, and the renovation works on the Garth residential hall and the development on St Mary's site would fill most of the gap in terms of the University's contribution. Reference is made to relevant policies relating to the application, and it is acknowledged that the principle of using the site for student accommodation is already established. We believe that it is reasonable to consider the possibility that providing purpose-built accommodation could mean that students will choose to live in this type of accommodation rather than in conventional houses. Evidence shows that there will be a need for student accommodation in Bangor and that we will need to address the needs of a similar number of students over the coming years.*

*Language assessment – Census figures show that there is a low proportion of Welsh speakers in the Deiniol ward; nevertheless, there has been a small increase since 2001. There is no guarantee that 'local' students will use the accommodation, however, the planning system or the university cannot differentiate on the grounds of language with respect to the site's users. It is noted that the University has no intention to add to the total number of students during the university's academic term. The development will offer an alternative choice in terms of the type of accommodation and location and could lead to releasing houses for the local population, economic improvements etc. It is suggested that the University should consider offering courses for learning Welsh to new students, and protect and promote the language and the culture locally.*

*Transportation Unit – Rather than providing a costly separate car park which would be of very little benefit, an alternative idea would be to improve the appearance and condition of the footpaths between the site and the High Street.*

*The footpaths could be surfaced with a material known as 'slurry seal', which is painted over the current surface and extends its life. Also, consideration should be given to providing a tactile crossing point where the road must be crossed from one side to the other.*

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted that the aim was to:
- re-use historical buildings
  - re-use a site that needed to be improved
  - create local employment which will bring economic advantages to the County
  - use local providers



- (c) It was proposed to defer the decision because of the size of the site and the language implications.  
The proposal fell.
- (d) The following observations were noted in favour of approving the application:
- The development of the campus released private housing in the city
  - It was nice to see better use being made of the site
  - The campus offered a high quality development and consequently provided a good standard of accommodation to the students (low standard buildings on the George site would be closed).
  - A substantial investment for the area – need to ensure that local workers are used
  - Important to support the venture
- (dd) The following observations were noted against approving the application:
- Significant effect on the language

In response to a comment regarding the effect on the language, the Senior Planning and Environment Manager noted that a Language Assessment had been completed and that the Joint Planning Policy Unit had made observations on the assessment.

A member observed further that no response had been received from the Fire Service (given the problems with access to the site). It was explained that the Fire Service had offered observations and that a discussion could be held on installing yellow line restrictions if required.

It was proposed and seconded to accept the recommendation.

**RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the following conditions together with an additional condition regarding the demolition waste.**

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Agree on all materials
4. Controlling surface water
5. Highways conditions including a traffic management plan
6. Protecting trees
7. Submit information about a close-circuit television system
8. Submit a construction method statement
9. Landscaping
10. Archaeological records
11. Lighting scheme/street furniture/facilities
12. BREEAM
13. Working/construction hours
14. Biodiversity matters

**7. Application no. C14/0041/11/LL – The Former Ysgol Glanadda, Caernarfon Road, Bangor**

**Erect two blocks of flats to include a total of eight living units.**

Members of the Committee had visited the site before the meeting.

- (a) The Development Control Manager explained that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting on 03.03.14 so that the Members could visit the site before making a decision. Members were reminded that this was an application to erect two blocks of flats

which offered eight living units on the former Ysgol Glanadda site. The flats would include 6 two-bedroom units for 3 persons and 2 one-bedroom units for 2 persons.

It was expressed that the principle of the development was acceptable, but there was concern regarding the access to the building. It was reported that the applicant had submitted further details following discussions with the Highways Unit showing the measures for avoiding collision between pedestrians and vehicles. However, following concerns regarding the location of the proposed access, and the possibility of opening a new access from Caernarfon Road, the applicant had responded by referring to the following points:-

- (i) Prior to submitting the application it had been confirmed that the option of using the existing access from Tan y Graig was the option that would most likely be approved by the Transportation Unit.
- (ii) Two other options had been considered for gaining access to the site. The first option involved using and sharing the existing access to the hairdresser's shop next door and the second option involved creating a new direct access to the site by demolishing part of the boundary wall.
- (iii) The option of sharing the access with the hairdresser's shop was not practical based on the fact that the business' consent would have to be obtained to cross the land, the business would lose parking spaces and they would have to be paid substantial compensation for the loss of parking spaces. It would also be difficult for the residents of the proposed flats to gain access to the highway due to the sharp angle of the access.
- (iv) The option of creating a new access was not practical either based on the fact that the Highways Unit would not allow this (opposite a roundabout) from a technical and road safety perspective, there would be a need to redesign the layout of the flats and the parking spaces which would leave only four flats on the site, and losing 50% of the proposed units would mean that the plan would no longer be financially viable.
- (v) The existing access had been adapted in accordance with the requests of the Transportation Unit and these changes were appropriate to support road safety.

Taking the above points into consideration and having received confirmation from the Transportation Unit that the nearby roads that served the site and the number of parking spaces within the site were acceptable, it was not considered that there would be a significant detrimental impact on road and street safety should the application be approved. To this end it was believed that the proposal was acceptable based on the requirements of policies CH30, CH33 and CH36 of the GUDP.

The two local members were welcomed to the meeting. The member for the adjoining ward addressed the Committee.

- (b) The Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following points:
- He stated that they welcomed the development but requested that the access be from the direction of Caernarfon Road which bordered with the site, in order to safeguard the children who walked to school past the proposed access. He referred to a petition that had been submitted at the previous meeting.
  - They felt that the developer should consider the measures further as the site had been cleared and that a wall in front of the proposed houses would not be appropriate – people could become hidden from view behind the wall.

- They were not requesting to move the roundabout, but rather to have access to the roundabout.
- There was a need to make the best use of the proposed development so that it had a good appearance and was safe from the outset.
- It was not anticipated that creating a ramp was acceptable.
- They suggested an opportunity to discuss with the owner of the hairdressing business with regards to the use of the land behind the building.
- They appealed for the opportunity to make the site and entrance proper and safe from the very beginning, and noted that the applicant should make greater effort to resolve this.

(c) In response to the above observations, the Senior Development Control Officer for Transport noted that the Department had considered the observations from the previous Committee and stated that

- Access to the site already existed
- A new access on Caernarfon Road would be too close to the busy roundabout
- Visibility would be low when exiting the development in a vehicle.

It was proposed and seconded to defer the application. A request was made for the applicant to discuss further with the hairdressing business next door – there was no evidence that discussions had taken place. It was accepted that the response was likely to correspond to what had already been submitted, but it was only fair to address every option before coming to a decision.

(ch) Some members expressed that an access onto the main road would be more dangerous – the option submitted was the safest option.

**RESOLVED to defer the application – the applicant to hold a further discussion with the hairdresser’s business regarding the option of a shared access.**

**8. Application no. C14/0042/20/LL – Halfway House, Y Felinheli**

**Conversion of a pub to create six living units, to including demolition of a rear and side extension and creation of a new access**

(a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the application, which involved converting a public house to create six living units, demolishing an extension and making external alterations together with creating two new vehicular entrances and 13 parking spaces.

It was noted that in order to assess the application in the context of relevant policies, the agent had been informed that they must provide a bat survey, confirmation of affordable housing provision, a language and community statement together with evidence that the pub had been on the market for a specific period of time. This requisite information had not been received. Furthermore, it was noted that the application formed one part of four.

(b) It was noted that the following additional information/observations had been received:-

*Welsh Water had responded to the consultation and noted standard conditions.*

*Two additional objections had been received which noted that the proposal meant losing the character of the pub, and which objected to the proposed parking spaces within the existing beer garden, the number of proposed entrances, and a lack of affordable units.*

*A letter had been received from the applicant noting that he was aware of the need for affordable housing, a bat survey and a language and community statement; but he was*

*asking the Local Planning Authority to reconsider the need to comply with policies CH11 and D28 which related to protecting community services and public houses in this case.*

- (c) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following points:
- Agreed with the officers' opinion
  - Must look at the site in its entirety, and only one application should be submitted, not four.
  - Disappointed that no reference had been made to affordable housing, a language and community statement and a bat survey.
  - Needed evidence that the pub had been on the market – such a facility was to be welcomed in the village. The member would like to see a period of time allocated to give someone the opportunity to show an interest.
  - There was a need to hold further discussions with the applicant.

It was proposed to accept the recommendations to refuse the application. If the applicant responded to the requirements, it was possible for him to resubmit his application. It was added that it would be beneficial to hold a discussion regarding a single plan.

**RESOLVED to refuse the application on the following grounds:**

1. A Community and Language Statement has not been submitted with the application in order to assess the effect of the scale, location and size of the development on the social, linguistic and cultural cohesion of communities, therefore the proposal is contrary to policy A2 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan and the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Planning and the Welsh Language (2009) which states that proposals for a residential development of five or more units on sites that have not already been allocated for housing development in the development plan must submit a Community and Language Statement to enable the Local Planning Authority to make an informed decision on the effect of the development on the social, linguistic or cultural cohesion of communities.
2. No evidence was submitted as part of the application to prove that the unit has been continuously empty or empty for a long period of time and that the unit has been on the market as a commercial unit for a continuous period of 12 months for a reasonable price or rent, and that no reasonable offer has been rejected, therefore the proposal is contrary to policy CH11 and D28 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan which state that proposals that would result in losing a community resource or service should be refused unless strong and relevant evidence was submitted to the Council showing that the premises have been marketed unsuccessfully as a business for sale for a reasonable and fair price for a continuous period of 12 months.
3. A general need for affordable units has been identified within the village of Felinheli, and the proposal does not offer a proportion of affordable units, and it is therefore contrary to policy CH11 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan which states that proposals to convert buildings for residential use within the development boundaries of villages should include a proportion of units (which will vary from site to site) that satisfy an identified general local need for affordable housing, unless it can be proven to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, having considered all the relevant factors, that it would be inappropriate to provide affordable housing on the site.
4. The proposal includes creating two new separate vehicular entrances to serve the site in addition to an existing access that is located outside the application site. The location and number of proposed entrances are unsuitable and are likely to have an adverse effect on road safety and therefore the proposal is contrary to policy CH33 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan which states that developments should provide a safe vehicular access to the site which suits the local area.

5. A potential for the presence of bats has been identified on the site and no species report has been submitted as part of the application or any mitigation measures proposed, therefore the proposal is contrary to policy B20 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan which states that proposals that are likely to cause direct or indirect unacceptable disturbance or harm to protected species and their habitats will be refused unless it can be shown that the effects can be minimised or mitigated effectively.

**9. Application no. C14/0074/17/LL – Cae Llywarch Caravan Park, Llandwrog**

**Increase the use of a touring caravan site from 5 to 15 units, including creating a road within the site, hard standings and electricity hook-up points.**

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the application which involved formalising and intensifying the use of an existing touring caravan site from being a Caravan Club site for five units to a touring caravan site that was open to the general public and for a maximum of 15 touring caravans. It was also proposed to improve the access road and facilities within the site. (It was noted that improvements were being made to the access as part of the work of creating a cycle path along the roadside).

It was intended to reinforce the site's existing screening by planting hawthorn bushes in places where the current growth was weakest. There were existing toilet/washing facilities on the site.

Although the site was already being used for touring caravan purposes for the Caravan Club, the development was considered as a new site as the current site was not open to the public. In general, since the Caravan Club received an exemption for its sites, they did not require formal planning permission to use the site for siting touring caravans, provided the site satisfied the conditions of that exemption. Having weighed up the principle of the proposal, it was considered that it met the requirements of policy D19.

- (b) It was noted that the following additional information/observations had been received:-

*A response had been received from the Policy Unit with regard to the Language Assessment:*

*On the whole, it is not believed that the nature and scale of the proposed development is likely to have an adverse effect on the Welsh language.*

*We recommend that mitigation measures to protect and promote the Welsh language are implemented as part of the application.*

- (c) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following points in support of the application:
- The area was dependent on tourism
  - It was essential to support local initiatives
  - Addressed the development of the cycle path to improve the access
  - Needed to ensure that the site was for touring caravans only.
- (ch) A member commented that the application requested a 30% addition rather than the statutory 10%. In response to the comment the Development Control Manager noted that the policy applied to static caravans and that this was a new application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application in accordance with the following conditions:**

- five years
- comply with the plans

- 15 touring caravans only on the pitches as indicated in the plan
- caravans for holiday use only
- register of staying period
- all touring units must be moved entirely from the site between 1 October and 1 March of the following year
- the site not to be used until the access improvements are completed including widening the entrance and ensuring that the passing places are adequate to accommodate a car and a caravan
- landscaping condition.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 4.00 pm.