
PLANNING COMMITTEE

03.11.14

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

Councillors: Endaf Cooke, Elwyn Edwards, Gwen Griffith, Dyfrig Jones, June Marshall, Dafydd Meurig, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams, Owain Williams and Eurig Wyn.

Others invited: Councillors Lesley Day, Liz Saville Roberts, Mair Rowlands and R H Wyn Williams (Local members).

Also present: Aled Evans (Head of Regulatory Department), Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), Gwawr Teleri Hughes (Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Engineer – Development Control), Rhun ap Iarll (Senior Solicitor), Lowri Haf Evans (Member Support and Scrutiny Officer) and Sion M Owen (Member Support and Scrutiny Assistant)

Apologies: Councillor W. Tudor Owen. (As W. Tudor Owen had not declared to the Chair and the Officers that Councillor Craig ab Iago would be his substitute, Councillor Craig ab Iago was not allowed to take any further part in the meeting).
Councillor Llywarch Bowen Jones (Local member).

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Everyone was reminded of the order of the meeting. The above-mentioned apologies were noted.

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

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

- Councillor Dyfrig Jones in item 5 on the agenda (application number C14/0793/11/LL), because he was employed by Bangor University.
- Councillor Gruffydd Williams in item 5 on the agenda (application number C14/0833/14/LL) because he had worked for the company.
- Councillor Eirwyn Williams in item 5 on the agenda (application number C14/0812/41/AM) because he had a close relative who lived near the site.

The Members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and they 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 Michael Sol Owen (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0290/45/LL).
- Councillor June Marshall (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0553/11/LL);
- Councillor Eurig Wyn (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C14/0630/26/LL).

The Members withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussion on the applications in question and they did not vote on those matters.

- Councillor Mair Rowlands (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0553/11/LL);
- Councillor Liz Saville Roberts (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0584/43/LL);
- Councillor Lesley Day (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0793/11/LL).

3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

4. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee held on 13 October 2014, as a true record.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

Details of the applications were expanded upon and questions were answered in relation to the plans and aspects of the policies.

RESOLVED

1. Application number C14/0479/37/LL – Field No. 6645, near Moelfre Bach, Llanaelhaearn

A full application for a 3 blade 500kw wind turbine measuring 67 metres in height to the tip of the blades (hub height of 45 metres and blade rotor diameter of 44 metres), and associated works to include an entrance and access track, sub-station building and control unit.

The members of the Committee had visited the site and the nearby 'Planwydd' site on 22.9.14.

The Senior Solicitor noted that matters had arisen with regard to the validity of some of the letters that had been received during the consultation period. Following an investigation by the Council, he confirmed that these matters were now being investigated by the police; therefore it was not appropriate for these matters to be discussed. The letters that were the subject of the investigation had not been considered when preparing the report.

The Senior Solicitor elaborated that the officers were now satisfied with the responses to the consultation, and that it was appropriate for the Committee to deal with the application.

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the background of the application and added that the application had been deferred to give officers the opportunity to assess additional information submitted by the applicant, and in order to arrange a site visit. She drew attention to the list of documents the applicant had submitted to support the application, together with a series of community benefits he intended to provide through an arrangement with Antur Aelhaearn using the money that would derive from the turbine.

The following points were noted on this complex and contentious application:-

- the site was within 600m of the Llŷn AONB and was close to, and had a significant detrimental impact on the Llŷn and Bardsey Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest and the Tre'r Ceiri scheduled ancient monument.
- the application's detrimental effect on the residential amenities of nearby houses
- the "community benefit" of any application was not a relevant matter for a planning application.

(b) Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.

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

- She had a responsibility to refuse the application in order to protect the AONB
- Approving the application would set a precedent for other communities in Dwyfor
- The structure was too large and would draw attention
- There were errors and inaccuracies in the bat report
- The proposal was the landowners' dream disguised under a 'community banner'
- No evidence of the community benefit
- The turbine would affect children's sleep, development and health
- Endorsed the Council's recommendation to refuse

Taking advantage of the right to speak, a supporter of the application noted the following main points:-

- Gwynedd Council had already supported the application because *Gwynedd Werdd* had contributed money to support *Ynni Aelhaearn*
- There was no effect on the environment – this observation was supported by the Welsh Government's Head of Decisions, '*It is my opinion that the development would not be likely to have significant effect on the environment by the virtue of factors such as nature, size or location*'.
- There was no significant effect on the Planwydd site.
- The Government's request to support renewable energy projects in our communities.
- 100% of the proposal's net profit would go towards the Antur project.

(d) In presenting observations as the member of an adjoining ward, the member noted:

- National law meant that Councillors had a duty to protect historic nature
- The proposal was contrary to several policies
- Pleaded with the committee to refuse the application.

(dd) The Senior Planning Service Manager added that the report was lengthy and detailed and dealt with all relevant matters. The Committee was encouraged to give consideration to the relevant planning considerations and he noted that the application could not be approved based on community benefit – a clear explanation for this was included in the report. The main issue was the sensitivity of the location, and the members were reminded that the Council's statutory duty was to give consideration to protecting, maintaining and enhancing the AONB in accordance with the requirements of the relevant act. The planning department was of the view that the development was entirely contrary to the relevant planning policies and undermined the purpose of the AONB designation – this view was supported by NRW and CADW. The basis for the recommendation was very sound, therefore the Committee was warned, should the application be approved contrary to the recommendation, that there would be no choice but to refer the application to a cooling-off period.

(e) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

- (f) The following observations were noted in favour of the recommendation:
- The community benefits were to be commended, but there were so many planning considerations against it.
 - Supportive of renewable energy, but the site of the turbine bordered with historic locations of national and international importance.
 - Supportive of benefits to the local economy, but the proposal was not an initiative that would enrich the community.
- (ff) The following observations were noted against the recommendation:
- If the officers' advice and recommendation was accepted and they were misleading the members, what would happen if the application went to appeal?
 - Renewable energy was an essential consideration for communities in the future.
 - The enterprise provided benefits to the community (which was within an underprivileged area) and an injection of finance to a community during a period of financial cuts.
 - The Minister of Natural Resources was supportive of such enterprises, therefore there was concern, if the application was refused, that it would be submitted on appeal to the Minister, which would result in additional costs for the Council.
 - The economic benefits and environmental benefits must be weighed up.
 - It was a matter of opinion to consider the propriety of economic benefit for supporting or refusing the application.
- (g) In response to the above observations, the following was noted:-
- There was no assurance over controlling community benefit matters – a section 106 agreement had been submitted by the applicant, but the planning department would not be able to manage and monitor this.
 - The Local Planning Authority had made the decision in accordance with the Local Development Plan based on an assessment of the effects.

In accordance with Procedural Rule 22 (6), the following vote to refuse the application was recorded:

In favour of the proposal to refuse the application, (9) Councillors: Endaf Cooke, Gwen Griffith, Anne T. Lloyd Jones, June Marshall, Dafydd Meurig, Michael Sol Owen, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams

Against the proposal to refuse, (4) Councillors: Elwyn Edwards, John Pughe Roberts, Hefin Williams and Eurig Wyn.

Abstaining, (0)

RESOLVED to refuse the application

1. **The turbine due to its nature and location would create an unacceptably alien feature in the landscape, causing a significant detrimental impact on views into, out of and across the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty contrary to Policies B8, C26 and Strategic Policies 2 and 9 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan 2009, SPG Onshore Wind Energy (2014), Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7, July 2014) and Technical Advice Note 8: Renewable Energy (2005).**
2. **The nature and scale of the turbine is considered alien and unacceptable to its sensitive location near the Llŷn and Bardsey Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest and thus it would have an unacceptable detrimental impact on the character of the landscape and have an unacceptable detrimental**

impact on prominent and panoramic views the public have into, out of and across the open countryside contrary to Policies B12, B23 and C26 and Strategic Policies 3 and 9 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan 2009, SPG Onshore Wind Energy (2014), Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7, July 2014) and Technical Advice Note 8: Renewable Energy (2005).

3. The turbine would create an alien and unacceptable feature in the historic landscape and would harm the setting of scheduled ancient monuments and the visual relationship between them, and it is considered that it would also have an impact on the setting of nearby listed buildings. Therefore, the proposal would be contrary to policies B3, B7, C26 and Strategic Policy 3 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, SPG Onshore Wind Energy (2014), Planning Policy Wales (Edition 7, July 2014) and Technical Advice Note 8: Renewable Energy (2005) as well as Circular 60/96 'Planning and the Historic Environment'.
4. The turbine would create an alien and dominating feature in the landscape, which would be likely to have an unacceptably harmful impact on the amenities and living conditions of the residents of nearby properties, contrary to Policy B23 and Strategic Policy 9 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan (2009) and SPG Onshore Wind Energy (2014).

2. Application number C14/0290/45/LL – Ysgubor Wen, Penrallt, Pwllheli
The discussion on this application was chaired by the Vice-chair, Anne Lloyd Jones.

A new house for an agricultural worker

- (a) The Senior Planning Service Manager expanded on the background of the application, and noted that the Committee had decided to defer the application at its meeting on 7 July 2014 in order to receive more information regarding the details of the business; at a meeting on 22 September 2014, following a decision to approve the application contrary to the officers' recommendation, the matter was referred to a cooling-off period. It was reported that the main purpose of reporting back to the committee was to highlight the planning issues, the possible risks and the possible options for the Committee before they reached a final decision on the application.

It was highlighted that this was a rural site, approximately 150m outside the development boundary of the urban centre of Pwllheli. It was noted that the Council was not convinced that the applicant had a functional need to locate a dwelling on the site, given that the majority of his stock was kept on land in Llanaelhaearn. It was added that the applicant's stock had increased over the period of the application and by July 2014, it had increased to the adequate level for employing an agricultural worker. This again highlighted concerns and doubt regarding the evidence for the application, as the farming enterprise was immature and had not had time to establish to be able to justify an agricultural dwelling.

The Manager outlined the risks to the Council from approving the application, and drew attention to the need for special justification for building a new house in the countryside. It was considered that the proposal was contrary to policies C1 and CH9 of the GUDP, Supplementary Planning Guidance: Building Rural Houses in the Countryside, and Technical Advice Note 6: Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities. It was also considered that the house was substantially larger than the size of a four-bedroom affordable house. He outlined options for the Committee for determining the application.

- (b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:-

- The matters in the application were complicated and there was a need to give appropriate consideration to the regulations.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation, and to offer the applicant the opportunity to submit an application for a temporary unit in a location to be discussed/agreed, in order to give the applicant an opportunity to try to establish the business and prove that he had a viable agricultural business.
- (ch) The following observations were noted in favour of the recommendation:
- Submit an application for a temporary unit in a location to be discussed/agreed
 - Reduce the size of the house and move its location
- (d) The following observations were noted against the recommendation:
- Applying for and purchasing a temporary unit was costly;
 - There were stock disturbance problems on the site and thus surveillance of the site was needed;
 - Anyone who was trying to succeed in the agriculture industry should be welcomed and supported.

RESOLVED to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation, and to offer the applicant the opportunity to submit an application for a temporary unit in a location to be discussed / agreed, in order to give the applicant an opportunity to try to establish the business and prove that he has a viable agricultural business.

3. Application number C14/0482/14/LL

MORRISONS Supermarket, North Road, Caernarfon, LL55 1BA

Install three refrigeration units together with security/acoustic fencing (a part retrospective application).

- (a) The Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application, noting that it was a part retrospective application for installing three refrigeration units at the rear of the existing supermarket and erecting a metal palisade fence measuring 3m in height, with a natural timber fence on the outside of the palisade fence. This would safeguard visual amenities and reduce noise from the units. The proposal also involved removing the existing condenser unit on the roof of the supermarket building (this was considered an improvement as there was no screening at present).
- (b) The officer explained that these units were necessary because new freezers would be installed inside the supermarket as part of a scheme to renovate the inside, and these new units would reduce the carbon footprint of the supermarket as they were more efficient and sustainable than the current units on the roof. It was intended to locate the units in a redundant plot/space on the site that was faced with concrete and screened somewhat from the west by low bushes and a bund which extended to the north along the western edges of the main car park. It was believed that the proposal was acceptable and complied with relevant local and national planning policies and guidelines.
- (c) Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, but ensuring that the public footpath near the site was kept safe.

RESOLVED to approve the application subject to relevant conditions relating to:

1. **Five years.**
2. **In accordance with the plans.**
3. **Restrict the maximum noise levels emitted from the refrigeration units along with the equipment and machinery already in the building.**

4. Application number C14/0553/11/LL

Former garage adjoining Belle Vue Public House, College Road, Bangor, Gwynedd, LI57 2AN

The members of the Committee had visited the site before the meeting.

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the application, noting that it was a full application for planning permission to demolish an existing building and redevelop the site by erecting a new four-storey building to include a commercial unit on the ground floor with 13 living units in the form of self-contained living studios for students on the floors above. Facilities such as a launderette, bicycle storage and bin storage would also be provided. The proposed development site was located on College Road in Upper Bangor and within the city's development boundaries which had been designated as a sub-regional centre in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan 2009 (GUDP). The nearest part of the site was approximately 35 metres from the defined boundary of the conservation area to the south-east.
- (b) It was acknowledged that the proposed building was substantially larger than what the site contained at present, and the proposal was higher than adjacent buildings. In terms of the commercial unit, detailed information had not been submitted regarding the proposed use, however, it was observed that should the application be approved, a condition to restrict the use of the unit to a specific A1 use would be imposed. The Members were reminded that the existing building had been used as a commercial garage in the past, and the right to use the building as a garage remained. This meant that the business could be reopened without formal planning permission.

The proposal was acceptable and complied with local and national policies.

- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:-
- This would be the tallest building on College Road.
 - The height of the building would block out natural light into nearby houses.
 - The design of the building was not traditional and did not comply with the features of nearby houses – no other adjacent building had a flat roof.
 - 14 units was excessive.
 - No parking spaces had been allocated for the residents, considering that there were already parking problems in the area.
- (ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the agent noted the following main points:-
- Revised plans had been issued
 - Confirmed that there was a need for this type of development.
 - The site was completely suitable for such a development.
 - Improved the quality of the site.
- (d) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) noted that she objected to the development and she made the following main points:-
- The development was too large and was taller than existing buildings. It did not complement other nearby buildings and consequently it stood out. She drew

attention to the Belle Vue hotel and noted that it was a historic building, and that the new development would create a visual impact on the hotel.

- The development would have a harmful effect on the amenities of the people who lived permanently in Upper Bangor. The needs of the local people must be considered.
- No parking spaces had been allocated for the residents.
- The development did not respond to the demand. Student numbers were decreasing and several to let/rent signs were visible on College Road. She expressed concern about overdevelopment and overprovision in Upper Bangor. The Committee had to start refusing applications for student accommodation.
- Restrict the use of the unit to A1.
- Should the application be approved, it must be ensured that the petrol tanks were removed carefully and that specific measures were implemented to reduce risks and pollution for local residents.

(dd) The local member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) noted that she objected to the development and she made the following main points:-

- Neighbouring residents were concerned about the detrimental effect of the unit. A condition must be ensured to restrict the use of the unit as there was no need for more take-away establishments in Upper Bangor.
- A lack of parking spaces was bound to add to the problems that already existed.
- The size of the units was small.
- Four floors was excessive – the development would be taller than the Belle Vue Hotel.
- The applicant should consider accommodation for other sections of the community / society, and not students only.
- The absence of a planning strategy for Upper Bangor – the demand and the need for student accommodation units was reducing.

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

(f) During the ensuing discussion the following observations were highlighted:

- Creating purpose-built units for students released units for families in the community.
- The size of the rooms was too small.
- Would it be possible to have three floors instead of four?
- The development was an improvement on the garage that was there at present.
- Propose that the applicant should adopt some of the traditional features of the nearby houses for the development.
- Need to see the details of the fire escape.
- Look at installing an Eco Roof on the flat roof.
- Look at the need to insulate the walls to reduce noise as the site was located in a busy and lively area.

(ff) In response to the above observations, the officer noted:

- Reducing the size of the development from four to three storeys would mean having to submit a new application.
- The fire escape would be discussed through the building control procedure.
- Discussions could be held with the applicant with regard to the observations on building features, such as improving the design by including bay windows on the front to reflect the style of the rest of the street.

RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning and Environment Manager to approve the application subject to receiving and agreeing on improvements to the design and to relevant conditions relating to:

1. Time
2. Comply with the plans
3. Materials
4. Slate
5. Pollution/contamination control
6. Highways including the submission of a demolition/construction method statement.
7. Use of the commercial unit
8. Working hours for the construction
9. Note on Party Wall Act
10. Drainage

5. Application number C14/0584/43/LL

Minafon Stores, Llithfaen, Pwllheli, Gwynedd, LL53 6PA

Convert stores / office / builders' workshop into a dwelling house.

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the background of the application and explained that the application had been deferred by the Planning Committee on 22 September 2013 so that officers could consider a letter that had been received from the applicant on the day of the Committee, stating their willingness to accept a condition of affordability on the property. (Application C14/0082/43/LL to convert the building into an affordable house had been refused earlier this year, on the grounds that the size of the building did not reflect the size of an affordable house).

The intention was to convert a store/office/builders' workshop in the village of Llithfaen (on a site outside the village's development boundary) into a dwelling, together with ancillary works. The proposal submitted showed that a vast part of the ground floor would be converted into a house (one bedroom), with a section being divided to provide a garage/storage shed. The roof space had not been defined for any specific use. It was explained that the applicant had stated that the building's use as a business was not viable, therefore an application for it to be used as a house had been submitted. It had been offered for the applicant to consider dividing the house into two affordable dwellings or one house and one holiday home, but they had refused the offer.

Policy CH12 was highlighted – (conversion of buildings in rural villages and in open countryside for residential use) which stated that the conversion of buildings for residential use in the countryside would not be permitted without proving first that a suitable economic use could not be secured for the building, and if this could not be proved, conversion to residential use would be conditional on satisfying the following criteria:

1. a community local need for an affordable house was proved;
2. the proposal would not lead to the creation of a substantial number of new residential units which would be likely to have a harmful impact on the structure and character of the village and/or the community they were part of;
3. the proposal would not lead to the loss of a community resource or service unless strong, relevant evidence was submitted to the Council that the property had been marketed unsuccessfully as a unit for the relevant use at a reasonable and fair price, for sale or to rent, for a permanent 12 month period;

4. adequate arrangements were available to restrict the occupancy of the house initially and in perpetuity to those who had a community local need for an affordable house.

The resubmission of this application now showed that the size of the house had been reduced to approximately 72m² on the ground floor and that the garage/shed section was approximately 22.5m², which suggested that the size of the house was affordable. However, the application failed to recognise the substantial roof space that had already been prepared and divided into four useful rooms which could be used without difficulty. It was believed that the proposal was contrary to the conversion policy and to the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing, as the size of the conversion did not correspond with the need, and insufficient evidence had been presented with regard to securing a possible economic use for the building.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- The property would enable his son to stay in his native area and continue to work locally in the community.
 - There was no intention to consider a holiday unit, since making personal profit was not the aim.
- (c) A member of an adjoining ward (who was representing the local member, but who was not a member of this Planning Committee) noted her support to the application and she made the following main points:-
- A request for the Committee to consider an affordable housing condition
 - The size and price of the house were suitable for Affordable Housing requirements. The son had been assessed by Tai Teg as being eligible for an Affordable House.
 - The house sat naturally within the boundary of the village of Llithfaen.
 - The stores had been advertised for nine months for economic use.
 - There was no intention to extend the house because the land behind the house was not for sale.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application subject to the applicant signing a Section 106 Agreement restricting the property to an affordable house for local community need.
- (d) During the ensuing discussion the following observations were highlighted:
- This was an example of local need – an individual applicant who wanted to stay in the village.
 - Affordability should be considered based on its design and size, and not the m².
 - Consider holding discussions with the applicant to alter the building's plans for use of the ground floor only.

RESOLVED to delegate the right to the Senior Planning and Environment Manager to approve the application, subject to receiving amended plans showing a house that has a floor area that reflects the applicant's need for a two-bedroom affordable house, and subject to signing a Section 106 Agreement restricting the property to an affordable house for local community need and to relevant conditions relating to:

1. Time period
2. In accordance with the plans
3. Details regarding restricting the use of parts of the property so that they do not form part of the house.
4. Removal of permitted development rights (including the installation of windows)

6. C14/0630/26/LL**Rhoslan, Waunfawr, Caernarfon, LL55 4YU**

Erect a new dwelling, parking spaces and a gas tank (a revised scheme to that refused under application number C13/0369/26/LL)

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated that this was an application to erect a two-storey house and create parking spaces together with locating a garden shed and a gas tank on a plot of land that was currently part of the residential curtilage/garden of the property known as Rhoslan, Waunfawr. It was also proposed to create a parking space to serve Rhoslan which would be located at the rear of the dwelling itself.

It was explained that the plans for the application had been amended because of objections to the previous application that had been refused in May, 2014 for 2 two-storey semi-detached dwellings, on the grounds of overdevelopment, masking and loss of privacy. It was noted that the density of the proposal had been reduced from two units to one, and that the design and layout of the amended proposal was suitable.

- (b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) noted his support to the development and he made the following point:-
- The applicant and the officers had reached an agreement, therefore he urged the committee to approve the application.

- (c) Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.

RESOLVED to approve the application subject to relevant conditions relating to:

1. **Five years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Natural materials / slates**
4. **External materials**
5. **Welsh Water standard conditions**
6. **Landscaping**
7. **Removal of permitted development rights**
8. **Highways conditions**
9. **Details of boundaries/to be completed before occupancy**

7. C14/0772/39/LL**Haulfryn Talyfan, Abersoch, Pwllheli, LL53 7UD**

Change of use of a field to extend the boundary of a caravan site to relocate six holiday caravan pitches and locate four additional holiday caravans, together with landscaping and environmental improvements.

- (a) The Development Control Manager noted that the application was being deferred because amended plans had been received late in the day, and there was a proposal to arrange a site visit when the next Committee would be held in Pwllheli.

RESOLVED to defer the application in order to consider new plans and to undertake a site visit.

8. C14/0793/11/LL**Bangor University, College Road, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2DG**

Install a permanent structure / artwork that would be associated with the Pontio development, with associated works which would include creating a concrete slab, an access road and engineering works to adjust the ground levels.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated that the application involved installing a permanent structure/artwork associated with the Pontio development, together with associated works to include creating a concrete slab, an access road and engineering works to adjust the ground levels. The proposal was located within the Bangor Conservation Area and was close to a number of Listed Buildings that varied between Grade I and Grade II. The proposal was not considered to be contrary to relevant policies and there were no other material planning considerations that indicated otherwise.
- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the agent noted the following main points:-
- This was a good opportunity to promote the arts in Gwynedd
 - The designer's work was world-renown
 - The theme was the '*caban*' – it was not possible to emulate a historic building, but rather to create something which reflected the theme from a new perspective
 - The structure provoked curiosity and debate, and was fun
- (c) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) noted her objection to the development and she made the following main points:-
- The structure did not reflect the historical '*caban*' which was made of natural materials and conveyed the historical importance of the area.
 - Was it a structure or a building?
 - Taking into account Policy B23 on safeguarding amenities – there was no other fibreglass structure in the city
 - The building would encourage antisocial behaviour.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- (d) During the ensuing discussion the following observations were highlighted:
- A local sculptor should be considered
 - The slate industry must be celebrated, but not by constructing a bright green structure
 - The sculpture was an insult to the Quarrymen's work
 - The structure did not promote / add value
 - It was not suitable
 - The sculpture was contentious and contemporary in design, and the application must be considered in the context of the enormous developments in the Pontio scheme which were being erected around it.
 - The structure encouraged difference of opinion and initiated discussion, as it was contemporary and different.

RESOLVED to approve the application subject to relevant conditions relating to:

- 1. Time**
- 2. Plans**
- 3. Colours**
- 4. Agree on chippings to match the other footpaths associated with the development.**

9. C14/0812/41/AM**Unit 1-2, Agricultural Park, Llanystumdwy, Cricieth, Gwynedd, LL52 0LJ**

An outline application for an extension and alterations to an industrial building.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the application, noting that it was an outline application for erecting an extension on the western side of the existing production unit. The purpose of the new extension would be to ensure additional space for the fresh meat preparation service, Bwydlyn, which was part of Harlech Frozen Foods Ltd. Production work would continue in the original building while the extension would offer additional space for processing along with offices and storage space. It was also proposed to provide a hard standing of tarmac around the building for access, parking and storing materials. The development would expand the existing enterprise.
- (b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

RESOLVED to approve the application subject to relevant conditions relating to:

1. **Time: five years or two years after approving the reserved matters**
2. **Submit reserved matters within three years.**

10. C14/0833/14/LL**READY FOODS LTD, Unit 3, Lôn Cae Ffynnon, Cibyn Industrial Estate, Caernarfon, Gwynedd, LL55 2BD**

Extensions and alterations to the existing industrial unit in order to create a new reception, an office/meeting room, a new parking area and entrance, cold storage and a meat processing area.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the application, noting that it was a full application to undertake extensions and alterations to the current industrial unit in order to create a new reception, an office/meeting room, a new parking area and entrance, cold storage and a meat processing area.
- (b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

RESOLVED to approve the application subject to relevant conditions relating to:

1. **Five years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **External materials to be agreed**
4. **Welsh Water conditions relating to the disposal of surface and foul water from the site**
5. **Highways conditions**
6. **Public Protection Service conditions regarding floodlights, noise and air/odour pollution**

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 4.50 pm.