

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 24/11/14

---

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

**Councillors:** Elwyn Edwards, Gwen Griffith, Eric M. Jones (Substitute), Dilwyn Lloyd (Substitute), June Marshall, W. Tudor Owen, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Others invited:** Councillors John Brynmor Hughes, Aeron M.Jones, Liz Saville Roberts, John Wyn Williams and R.H.Wyn Williams (Local members).

**Also present:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), Keira Ann Sweenie (Senior Development Control Officer), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Officer – Transport) and Bethan Adams (Member Support and Scrutiny Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillors Endaf Cooke, John Pughe Roberts and Owain Williams and Councillors Llywarch Bowen Jones, Dafydd Meurig and Mair Rowlands (Local Members).

### 1. WELCOME

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. Everyone was reminded of the order of the meeting.

It was noted that the meeting would not be recorded due to technical problems.

### 2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

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

- Councillor Gruffydd Williams in item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0653/43/LL) as his father was the applicant.
- Councillors Anne Lloyd Jones and Michael Sol Owen in item 5 on the agenda (planning applications C14/0849/19/LL and C14/0884/45/LL), because they were members of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.

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 Aeron M. Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning applications C14/0276/24/LL and C14/0659/24/AM);
- Councillor John Brynmor Hughes (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0357/39/LL).
- Councillor Liz Saville Roberts (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0653/43/LL).
- Councillor R. H. Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0689/39/LL);
- Councillor June Marshall (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0697/11/LL);
- Councillor John Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0825/25/LL);

- Councillor Michael Sol Owen (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0884/45/LL).

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

### 3. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee held on 3 November 2014, as a true record and subject to:

- Adding Councillor Peter Read's name under 'Others invited' on page 1.
- Amending a sentence in the Welsh version under planning application C14/0793/11/LL on page 11 to read 'The local member, who *objected* to the development, noted...' rather than 'The local member, who supported the development...'
- Amending a sentence in the English version, 'The local member (a member of this Planning Committee)...' under planning application C14/0793/11/LL on page 12 to read 'The local member (*not* a member of this Planning Committee)...'

### 4. 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 no. C14/0276/24/LL – Ceiriog Belan, Rhos Isaf, Caernarfon

Construction of an affordable house, improvements to the existing access together with retention of garden sheds (a part retrospective application).

- The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the site was located on the north-eastern periphery of the village of Rhos Isaf which had been designated as a rural village in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan (GUDP). It was noted that the applicant was eligible under policy CH5 of the GUDP to qualify for an affordable home in the area.

It was noted that the applicant had widened the watercourses on the site in order to improve the flow of surface/ground water through the site and to avoid any flooding in the future. It was reported that the Land Drainage Unit had no objections. It was believed that the proposal was acceptable on grounds of Policy B32 of the GUDP and all other relevant policies.

- The following main points were made by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee):-
  - That generally, neighbours were not opposed to the development;
  - There was concern in terms of the lack of planning control in relation to the changes that had already been undertaken on the site;
  - Suggested including a condition that the water courses were the responsibility of the applicant;
  - As the road was exceptionally narrow, a condition should be imposed that construction traffic should not attend the site before 9.30am and or 4.30pm;
  - That Llanwnda Community Council asked for consistency in dealing with such applications and in fairness to all applicants.

In response to the observations of the local member, the Development Control Manager noted that it would be possible to include a condition in terms of the responsibility for the watercourses along with a condition relating to the hours of receiving deliveries on site.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application with the additional conditions.

- (c) In response to a member's observation regarding providing a pavement for pedestrians, the Senior Planning Manager noted that as the site was rural, there was no requirement for a pavement and that the Transportation Unit did not object.

A member asked if it could be possible to restrict the time for receiving deliveries on the site to 3.00pm. In response, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the service would ensure that the time condition would be reasonable.

**RESOLVED to delegate the right to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application subject to the applicant signing a 106 legal agreement relating to the occupancy of the house provided here in the first instance and in perpetuity to those who can prove a local community need for an affordable house, and to relevant conditions relating to:-**

1. Commencing the work within two years of the date of the permission itself.
2. In accordance with the plans.
3. Natural slate.
4. Removal of permitted development rights
5. Welsh Water conditions.
6. Highways conditions.
7. Landscaping.
8. Removing the two caravans from the site completely when the house becomes habitable.
9. Safeguarding watercourses.
10. Hours for receiving goods to the site.

**2. Application number C14/0357/39/LL - Tyn Morfa, Llanengan**

Alterations and extension to the house and construction of a separate building to include a garage and work studio.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that a decision on the application had been deferred at the meeting held on 22 September 2014 in order for Officers to hold discussions with the applicant to seek to reach an agreement on reducing the scale of the extension and the garage/studio building. It was explained that a site visit was held on 22 September 2014 in accordance with the Committee's decision at its meeting on 1 September 2014.

It was reported that following discussions with the applicant that the garage element had been removed from the proposal and the separate building would now comprise the studio element only. Confirmation had been received from the applicants that they did not wish to change the extensions to the house as it met their needs as per the original submission.

It was noted that the separate building was now acceptable as it was in keeping with the existing property and the surrounding environment in terms of its scale, size and form. However, it was considered that the two-storey rear extension was dominant and incompatible with the existing property.

It was noted that the property was located in open countryside and within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and that the site was open and that very little

vegetation surrounded it. Attention was drawn to the concerns of the AONB Officers in terms of the scale of the development.

(b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), supported the application and he made the following main points:-

- That he had participated in the discussions between the applicant and the officers and that alterations to the separate building were acceptable;
- That the local community supported the application;
- That the house had belonged to the family for five generations;
- That the applicant's architect was of the opinion that the location as noted in the plans was the best place for the extension in order to strengthen the walls of the old house;
- That the application should be approved.

Proposed and seconded to approve the application contrary to the officers' recommendation.

(c) During the discussion, the following observations were made:-

- That the design and the size of the studio building had been amended following the discussions;
- That the garage element had been removed from the proposal;
- That the extension to the curtilage had been reduced;
- That the AONB Unit was only expressing concern;
- That the development was in keeping with the area and would not affect the AONB;
- That the applicant had the right to improve the appearance of the house;
- That a decision had to be made on the application in accordance with planning policies;
- That the site was within an AONB;
- That approving the application would create a dangerous precedent.

(d) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted:-

- That discussions had been held with the applicant and that a compromise had been reached on the scale of the separate building;
- During the discussions many options had been presented to the applicant in terms of the design of the extension that would respect the location of the application;
- As the site was located in the AONB, there was a statutory requirement to protect the objectives of the designation;
- Determining the application was a matter for the Committee.

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

**In favour of the proposal to approve the application (8)**, Councillors: Elwyn Edwards, Eric M. Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, W. Tudor Owen, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Against the proposal to approve (3)**, Councillors: Gwen Griffith, Anne T. Lloyd Jones and June Marshall.

**Abstaining, (1)** Councillor Michael Sol Owen

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Time

2. Plans
3. Slate
4. Materials
5. Ancillary use to the studio
6. Withdrawal of general permitted development rights.

**3. Application number C14/0558/41/LL – Lleifior, Llangybi**

Change of use of land from agriculture to domestic curtilage and erection of garage/workshop.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application, noting that the size of the curtilage extension was considered reasonable and that the scale and finish of the garage/workshop was in keeping with the house in terms of colours and wall materials and was suitable in terms of a building for domestic use and therefore the application met with the requirements of policies B22 and B25 of the GUDP.

It was noted that it was considered that imposing a condition to limit the use for domestic use only would make the development acceptable under policy B23 of the GUDP.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the objector noted the following main points:-
- Concerns by neighbours that the plans were misleading;
  - The land was higher to the rear of the houses, therefore, the garage/workshop would act as a mask;
  - That there was an empty plot nearby and the development would affect the value of any house built on the site in future;
  - That consideration should be given to moving the garage/workshop;
  - That the development was contrary to policies B22, B23, C1, C7 and C28 of the GUDP.
  - That the size of the garage/workshop was unacceptable and it was therefore an overdevelopment in the countryside.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- That the garage/workshop was for domestic use only;
  - That the size of the garage/workshop had been reduced after receiving concerns from neighbours;
  - That the location and the proposed design are acceptable under the policies;
  - That the curtilage of the house had been extended in order to create a bigger garden;
  - There was no planning, environmental or legal reason for refusing the application.

Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Five years.
2. Materials to match the existing dwelling.
3. Grey coloured roof.
4. Domestic use only/supplementary to the residential use of the property known as Lleifior, Llangybi.
5. Comply with the plans.
6. Withdrawal of permitted development rights.
7. No caravans to be sited on the land.

**4. Application no. C14/0618/34/LL – Derwin Fawr, Garndolbenmaen**

Full application for the erection of a third 50kw wind turbine on a 24.6 metre column, total height of 34.2 metres to tip of blade.

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the background of the application noting that the size of the third turbine meant that the three turbines could be seen to the same extent from the majority of vantage points. It was added that the turbine would be the same colour as the other two turbines.

It was noted that the area of the application was a rural and agricultural area with 50m electricity pylons approximately 120m from the site that was prominent in the landscape. Snowdonia National Park was located approximately 800m to the east and the AONB over 3km from the application site.

It was noted that after considering all the relevant policies and planning matters it was not believed that the development would have a substantial negative effect on the landscape generally, or on the neighbouring National Park. In the context of national policies relating to renewable energy and local policies relating to the landscape, amenities and renewable energy it was not believed that the proposal was contrary to these relevant policies.

- (b) Attention was drawn to the additional observations received from Natural Resources Wales noting that it would be appropriate to impose a 'curtailment' on the planning permission in order to protect the Favourable Conservation Status of bat species and the application would not be refused should a suitable condition be implemented.

It was noted that there was uncertainty in terms of the propriety of the condition suggested by NRW and a request was made for the right to approve the application subject to receiving further explanation from NRW regarding the propriety of the curtailment condition and subject to the relevant conditions.

- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- That the family farm was seeking to diversify to secure the farm's future;
  - That the area of the application site was an industrial one with small businesses;
  - There were four electricity pylons and an electricity station on the land around the site;
  - That ensuring the continuation of agriculture would enable the Welsh language to continue;
  - That it was hoped that the application could be approved in accordance with the recommendation.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application subject to receiving favourable observations from NRW.

- (d) During the discussion, the following observations were made:-
- It should be stated that NRW were inconsistent in their observations on applications;
  - That it was an overdevelopment as there were two wind turbines there already;
  - That approving the application would create a cumulative impact;
  - That the amount of £250 a year agreed to by the applicant as a contribution to North Wales Air Ambulance was low;
  - That the application for a turbine in Llanaelhaearn at the last meeting had been refused on grounds of policies B8, B12, B23, B33 and C26 of the GUDP, why was this application any different?
- (e) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted:-
- That the observations received from NRW were complicated and they would contact NRW to note the Committee's opinion;
  - It was not considered that there would be a cumulative impact given the broader landscape;
  - That financial contributions for community benefit were controlled outside the planning system;
  - That every application should be considered on its own merits.

**RESOLVED to approve the application subject to receiving favourable observations from Natural Resources Wales.**

Conditions:

1. Commence work within two years.
2. In accordance with the plans.
3. Colour to match the other turbines.
4. Noise.
5. Bblades to move in the same direction.
6. Ddecommissioning.
7. Submit a curtailment plan for safeguarding bats.
8. Underground cable connection to the grid.

**5. Application Number C14/0653/43/LL – Gwynus Caravan Park and Golf Course, Pistyll**

Upgrade existing static caravan park and relocate all static caravans from part of field 472 to a part of field 470.

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

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application noting that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 22 September 2014, in order to hold a site visit.

It was noted that the proposal involved relocating 10 static caravan units from field 472 to field 470. It was reported that the additional information had been submitted by the applicant's agent noting that it was intended to use part of field 472 to store touring caravans during the winter months.

It was highlighted that the proposal involved relocating the static holiday caravans to a more prominent location in the landscape and outside the existing boundaries of the caravan park; therefore it was not considered that the proposal complied with criterion 2, policy D17 of the GUDP.

It was explained that the plans submitted with the application highlighted that the size of the caravan site would increase from 1.69ha to 4.96ha therefore it could not be deemed as a small extension. It was added that the size and nature of the proposed extension equated to creating a new static caravan site.

It was noted that the application site was located in the countryside and within the AONB and Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Outstanding Historical Interest.

It was considered that the proposed location was more visible in terms of its location than the existing caravan site. As a result, it was not considered that the proposal would ensure that the character of the AONB would be protected, maintained or improved and, therefore; the proposal would significantly harm the rural landscape of the AONB contrary to the requirements of Policy B8 of the GUDP.

- (b) Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.
- (c) The application was supported by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), and she made the following main points:-
- In visiting the site they should have looked at the site from afar in order to realise that the site was in its own valley and there would be no impact on the landscape;
  - That interpreting policies B8, D16 and D17 of the GUDP was a matter of opinion;
  - The applicant was willing to accept a landscaping condition;

- That the business had existed since the 50s and the proposed changes would make it viable;
- That the intention was to make the site more attractive;
- The proposal would contribute to the sustainability of a local cabin-supplying business;
- It would be possible to approve such applications if there was an economic benefit;
- That the applicant was attempting to balance the viability of the family business with protecting the AONB;
- Only a third of the field would be used;
- Ask the members to consider approving with conditions.

(d) In response to the observations of the local member, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted:-

- That discussions had been held in relation to other options;
- It was considered that upgrading with an increase of three or four times the surface area of the site, as noted in the plans, would be totally contrary to the requirements of Policy D17 of the GUDP.
- That applications where the location of sites were moved from prominent locations to concealed locations would be supported in order to ensure that the character of the AONB would be protected, maintained and improved, however; in this case the caravan site would be moved to a more prominent location;
- That if the Committee decided to approve the application, the matter would have to be referred to a cooling-off period as this would be completely contrary to the GUDP and would undermine the Council's planning policies.

(e) Proposed and seconded to approve the application contrary to the officers' recommendation.

The following observations were noted in favour of approving the application:

- That this application sought only to upgrade the site;
- That plenty of space was needed between the cabins in order to ensure that the business was viable and that it addressed tourists' needs;
- That the site was located in a valley and there would be no visual impact;
- That the proposal only involved exchanging 10 caravans for 10 cabins;
- That the development secured jobs and was a boost to the local economy;
- That 2,000 trees had been planted in order to conceal the site and imposing a landscaping condition would be sufficient;
- The impact on the AONB was a matter of opinion.

(f) The following observations were noted against approving the application:

- That the application was contrary to the policies;
- That approving the application would create a dangerous precedent;
- There was a duty to protect the AONB;
- That tourists came to this area to enjoy nature and the scenery;
- That the application meant a large extension to the site and into the countryside.

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

**In favour of the proposal to approve the application (6)**, Councillors: Elwyn Edwards, Eric M. Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, W. Tudor Owen, Eirwyn Williams, and Eurig Wyn.

**Against the proposal to approve (5)**, Councillors: Gwen Griffith, Anne T. Lloyd Jones, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen and Hefin Williams.



**Abstaining, (0)**

**RESOLVED to approve the application, contrary to the planning officers' recommendation.**

**Reasons:**

No visual impact.

That the proposal did not involve creating a new site or an unacceptable extension to the site.

**The Senior Planning Service Manager noted his intention, in accordance with the Procedural Rules of this committee, to refer the application to a cooling-off period and to bring a further report before the committee highlighting the risks associated with approving the application.**

**6. Application No C14/0659/24/AM – Land opposite Glanrhyd Isaf, Dinas, Llanwnda, Caernarfon**

Erection of six affordable dwellings and new access.

It was confirmed that this application had been withdrawn.

**RESOLVED to accept and note the above.**

**7. Application No. C14/0689/39/LL – Glyndŵr, Abersoch**

Exchange an existing chalet for a dwelling house

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the site was within the development boundary of Abersoch and within the AONB. It was noted, given the range of the design and size of the houses in the vicinity of the application site, that it was not considered that the modern design of the house would look out of place.

Reference was made to an objector's observation relating to a recent unsuccessful appeal for a house on the Anhywel plot, and it was noted that the inspector had considered that the principle of developing the site for residential purposes was acceptable in respect of the urban character, but that the size of that property constituted an overdevelopment of the confined site, and that it would therefore fail to maintain the character of the AONB. It was emphasised that every application had to be considered on its own merits, and in this case it was believed that the proposal was acceptable in terms of the scale in this location.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member objected to the application (not a member of this Planning Committee) and the following main points were made:-
- Question why developments had been refused previously;
  - There was a need to consider the Anhywel application that was refused on appeal;
  - It was hoped that the application would be refused as it was an overdevelopment and that the modern design was not suitable in the AONB;
  - Should the application be approved, it would open the door to other applications.

Proposed and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the officers' recommendation.

- (c) During the discussion, the following observations were made:-

- The proposal was an overdevelopment that would have a detrimental impact on the AONB;

- That a precedent would be set should the application be approved;
- That the proposal was contrary to policy B8 of the GUDP.

- (d) In response to a member's question regarding refusing planning applications on the site in the past, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the policy context had changed and that each application should be dealt with individually. It was noted that the principle of the development was acceptable but the members' concerns regarding the AONB were noted.

**RESOLVED to refuse the application, contrary to the planning officers' recommendation.**

Reason:

The proposal is contrary to policy B8 of the GUDP as it is an overdevelopment that would have a detrimental impact on the AONB.

**8. Application number C14/0697/11/LL – 88 Farrar Road, Bangor**

Erect a two-storey dwelling following a refusal under reference C14/0060/11/LL

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the site was within the development boundaries of the city of Bangor and was considered to be a previously developed site. It was noted that an attempt had been made to locate the new building in an area that would be likely to have the least effect on 88 Farrar Road, whilst also avoiding including too many windows on the rear of the building which would cause concerns in terms of overlooking.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) noted that he did not object to the proposal and asked for the alignment of the house to be reconsidered in order for it to match the other buildings.
- (c) In response to the local member's observations, the Development Control Manager noted that discussions could be held with the applicant in relation to changing the appearance of the building from Farrar Road.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application subject to holding discussions with the applicant.

**RESOLVED to approve the application subject to the officers holding discussions with the applicants in the context of the elevation from Farrar Road.**

Conditions:

1. Time.
2. Comply with plans.
3. Materials / slates.
4. Landscaping.
5. Complete the access and parking spaces.
6. Drainage matters.
7. Removal of permitted development rights.
8. Note on requirements of party wall act

**9. Application number C14/0825/25/LL – Tŷ Coch, Glasinfryn, Bangor**

Creation of new access track.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded upon the background of the application and noted that the application was to create a new access track to a site that had received planning permission to convert empty outbuildings into four holiday units under reference C13/0765/25/LL.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the Transportation Unit did not object to the application.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the objector noted the following main points:-
- The Planning Inspector had been satisfied that the track and associated improvements were acceptable and that his directions should be followed;
  - That the proposal did not comply with policy CH25 of the GUDP or Paragraph 44 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG); Converting Buildings in Open Countryside and in Rural Villages;
  - That using the existing track rather than creating a new track would reduce the impact on the environment;
  - That increasing the number of accesses would lead to more accidents;
  - Unnecessarily detrimental to the countryside.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:-
- That the Transportation Unit, the Biodiversity Unit nor Natural Resources Wales had objected to the proposal;
  - The previously approved proposal had received objection relating to using the existing access track and also now with the new track;
  - Drainage work had been undertaken that prevented water from running to the highway and therefore objecting on these grounds was incorrect;
  - The new track would mean that fewer cars would drive past nearby houses;
  - The track would be convenient for all and there was no reason to refuse the application.
- (d) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:-
- That the new track would not be safer;
  - No evidence had been submitted that the water flow had stopped running to the highway;
  - His concern that there would be nothing on the new track to prevent the water and that that the slate waste laid down on the track would end up on the highway;
  - His concern was that the number of accidents would increase.
- (e) In response to the local member's observations, the officers noted:-
- No observations had been received from the Land Drainage Unit, however a condition could be imposed that a comprehensive surface water plan should be submitted should the committee so wish;
  - That the new access was acceptable to the Transportation Unit and that discussions had been held with the applicant's agent and that suitable measures to address the surface water problem had been included in the plan. It was noted that there would be five metres of hard surface tarmac to prevent the slate waste on the remainder of the track from moving to the highway.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application with an additional condition relating to a comprehensive surface water plan.

A vote was taken on the proposal and it fell.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

**RESOLVED to refuse the application.**

**Reason:**

The proposal is contrary to policy CH25 of the GUDP and paragraph 44 of the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Converting Buildings in Open Countryside and in Rural Villages.

**10. Application no. C14/0865/16/LL – Plas y Coed, Bangor**

Re-submission of application C14/0205/16/LL which was refused, for relocating a vehicular access, along with re-orientating three houses and associated gardens as approved under reference C11/1077/16/LL.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that it had been revised from the refused application by increasing the height of the existing boundary wall between the proposed access and the property known as Plas y Coed Lodge to 1.5 metres and including a band of additional intense landscaping. A piece of land was also proposed for parking specifically for the Lodge according to the information that had been submitted with the application.

It was noted that the Biodiversity Unit was happy to accept the amendment to relocate the access provided that a condition was imposed to remove the right to undertake permitted developments in these gardens unless a formal planning application was submitted and approved.

It was not believed that this proposal was unacceptable compared with what had previously been approved and as shown in the report, the changes as submitted were required for specific reasons.

- (b) Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:-
- The site had been designated as a development site in the UDP;
  - They had failed to reach an understanding with the owner of the Lodge, but the height of intense landscaping on the site's boundary had been increased in order to reduce the effect on amenity and protect the privacy of The Lodge.
- (d) A member read the observations of the local member who had apologised:
- A compromise had been made when the original application had been approved that the estate entrance should be as far as possible from the house;
  - Amending the entrance would affect the residential amenities of the residents of The Lodge;
  - Natural Resources Wales continued to object to the application, unless information was submitted demonstrating that there would be no effect on trees;
  - The applicant noted that the Penrhyn Estate objected to the location of the access, but they had no objection to the original application that had been approved;
  - The Transportation Unit had been satisfied with the original access;
  - It was hoped that the Committee would refuse the application as the application did not comply with policies B19, B20 and B23 of the GUDP.
- (e) In response to the local member's observations, the Development Control Manager noted that the relevant officer in NRW was on holiday, therefore they were awaiting confirmation that NRW were satisfied with the proposal if a condition relating to the removal of permitted development rights was imposed.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Materials
4. Removal of permitted development rights
5. Landscaping details
6. Note on Party Wall Act requirements

Councillor June Marshall noted that she had abstained from voting on the above.

**11. Application no. C14/0939/13/LL – Yr Hen Fecws, Tyn y Coed, Carneddi, Bethesda**

An extension on the side of the property.

- (a) Attention was drawn to the fact that the location plan before the report on the application in the agenda was incorrect.

The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that no objections had been received to the proposal.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Time
2. Plans
3. Slates on the roof

Welsh Water Note

The discussion on the remaining applications was chaired by Councillor Gwen Griffith.

**12. Application no. C14/0849/19/LL – Land near 61-72 Llwyn Beuno, Bontnewydd**

Create five new car parking spaces, footpaths and a fence and construct four storage units for keeping bicycles.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the proposal met the need for parking spaces.

Referring to the objections, it was noted that although plots/gardens were being exchanged for the additional parking provision along with the small bicycle storage provision, a green strip approximately 3m wide would remain between the rear of the flats and the new parking spaces to safeguard some amenity space for the tenants.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:-
- They had consulted with tenants on the proposal and most of them were supportive;
  - A bicycle storage was needed as bicycles were currently being kept in internal amenity areas, causing a fire risk;

- Tenants were not entitled to have an allotment in their gardens, but Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd (CCG) was willing to discuss a location for them.

Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.

- (d) In response to an observation from a member, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that management of the parking spaces was a matter for Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.

A member noted his support for the application and welcomed the fact that the company were searching for another location for the tenants' allotment.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. In accordance with the plans

**13. Application no. C14/0884/45/LL – Land opposite 82 Abererch Road, Pwllheli**

An application to revise the layout and design of the six houses approved under application C13/1209/45/LL and also construct one additional single-storey house that would provide a total of seven houses on the site.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the site was within the development boundary of Pwllheli and that no objections had been received to the proposal.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:-
- CCG had a shortage of smaller properties, and the proposal would meet housing needs and would improve the site's appearance;
  - The provision would meet needs for purpose-built properties for older people and disabled people on Abererch Road;
  - An information event had been held in September 2013 where support had been received to the proposal.

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

Members noted their support to the development which would satisfy the area's accommodation needs.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with plans.
3. Slates on the roof.
4. Agree on the finish of the external walls.
5. Removal of permitted development rights for extensions and curtilage buildings.
6. Welsh Water conditions as the previous application.
7. Highways conditions as the previous application.

The meeting commenced at 1pm and concluded at 3:50pm