

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 12.1.15

---

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

**Councillors:** Councillors Craig ab Iago, Elwyn Edwards, Gwen Griffith, Dyfrig Wynn Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd (Substitute), June Marshall, W. Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Others invited:** Councillors R. H. Wyn Williams, Llywarch Bowen Jones, John Wyn Williams, Anwen Davies and Seimon Glyn (Local members).

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Keira Sweeney (Senior Development Control Officer), Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Dafydd Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Officer – Minerals and Waste), Dylan Wyn Jones (Traffic Improvements Team Manager and Development Control), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Lowri Haf Evans (Member Support and Scrutiny Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillors Owain Williams and Liz Saville Roberts

### 1. 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 (application number C14/0653/43/LL) as he was the applicant's son; (application numbers C14/1065/42/LL and C14/1083/42/LL) as his father owned a caravan park that was located less than six miles from the site.
- Councillor Michael Sol Owen in Item 5 on the agenda (application numbers C14/1042/11/LL and C14/1043/11/LL) as he was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd (the application's developers)
- Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones in Item 5 on the agenda (application numbers C14/1042/11/LL and C14/1043/11/LL) as she was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd (the application's developers)

The Members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and they withdrew from the Chamber during the discussions on the items noted.

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

- Councillor R. H. Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda, (planning applications C14/0638/39/LL and C14/0902/39/LL);
- Councillor Llywarch Bowen Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0653/43/LL);
- Councillor John Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C14/0745/25/HY);
- Councillor Anwen Davies (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C14/0885/33/LL);
- Councillor Nigel Pickavance (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C14/1042/11/LL and C14/1043/11/LL);
- Councillor Seimon Glyn (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/1083/42/LL).

## 2. MINUTES

The Chairman signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee held on 15 December 2014 as a true record, subject to:

- i. Amending the sentence in the English minutes, item 1.6 – *Councillor Trefor Edwards (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 6 on the agenda (planning application number C14/1011/19/LL) – to note Councillor Christopher Hughes (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 6 on the agenda (planning application number C14/1011/19/LL).*

## 3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

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

### RESOLVED

#### 1. Application number C14/0638/39/LL – 132, Cae Du, Abersoch.

Extend the curtilage of the property, construct a two-storey side extension and extend patio area.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application, explaining that the plan had been amended since it had first been submitted. It was reported that the original plan showed a balcony on the first floor level of the extension but this had now been removed from the proposal. In terms of the principle of the development, it was noted in general that policies B22 and B24 of the Unitary Development Plan approved proposals to extend existing dwellings, provided they complied with associated criteria aimed at safeguarding the recognised features and character of the landscape and environment, together with the character and amenity value of the local area.

It was explained that the property was located within a high-density residential area and that some overlooking was likely to exist regardless. The original plan had been amended in response to the observations of the Transportation Unit, as they had been concerned that the balcony would be a form of distraction for drivers at a location close to a turning. As a result, the proposal was considered acceptable in respect of policies CH33 and CH36 and it was not believed that it would affect road safety or parking. It was not considered that the proposal would affect the area's visual amenities or the character of the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and the design of the extension was considered acceptable.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and he made the following main points:-
  - Houses on the Cae Du estate were already located close together.
  - He requested the Planning Committee to be more alert to applications for extensions in this estate – 85% of the houses were holiday homes, and approving this application would set a precedent.
  - He accepted that the plan had been changed, but the extension still had an impact on neighbouring residents' privacy.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to undertake a site visit. The proposal fell. It was accepted that there was sufficient information in the report.

- (ch) Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.
- (d) During the discussion, the following observations were made:
- There was potential here for overdevelopment
  - The views of the Community Council must be taken into consideration, and start saying enough is enough.
- (dd) The Senior Planning Service Manager noted that every application had to be dealt with on its own merits, and it was considered that the application before the Committee complied with the relevant planning policies.

**Resolved: To approve the application subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Commencement within five years.**
2. **In accordance with the revised plan.**
3. **Slates to match those of the existing property.**
4. **The external walls of the extension and the wall around the patio to complement the existing property in terms of colour and texture.**

## **2. Application number C14/0645/22/MW – Dolbebin Slate Tip, Talysarn**

Resubmission of a previously refused application for the removal of material from a mineral working deposit and associated processing operations.

- (a) The Senior Planning Manager – Minerals and Waste expanded on the background of the application, noting that it was a resubmission for the removal of part of a slate tip that had been refused planning permission in January 2015. The proposal was to quarry an area of 7,500m<sup>2</sup> in part of the mineral working deposit measuring 3.16ha along with associated processing operations. The plans with the application indicated a reduced footprint for the ancillary processing area and site compound which had been submitted with the previous application (C13/1052/22/MW) – the Manager highlighted that the application had been amended so that the site compound was formed within the area at the foot of the tip. It was intended to use the slate waste recovered during the construction of the compound to create an access road which would serve the development directly from the B4418 as was approved under planning permission C11/1140/22/LL.

It was also added that amended details for the current application included the removal of all slate crushing activity, a revised noise assessment which had been undertaken in August 2014, a methodology for ecological mitigation and a restoration strategy, and locating the site compound within the footprint of the tip.

It was noted that insufficient evidence had been submitted regarding noise and the impact on nearby residents. It was believed that the applicant had failed to show that the development, in terms of impact and noise, could comply with the relevant guidelines. Members were also reminded that the Council's Public Protection Service objected to the application, as approving it could create a statutory nuisance in the form of noise resulting from the development.

With respect to the need for the development, reference was made to policy C15 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, which stated that proposals to remove material from a mineral working deposit must comply with a series of criteria. The local market was

already served by working sites nearby, and there was not a strong enough argument that Dolbebin Tip had the capacity to supply slate that had different features, colour and texture to the slate supply from operational sites, and in terms of the local or regional need. Therefore, there was no justification for approving a new slate extraction site in Dyffryn Nantlle.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:
- The development caused concern and worry for the residents of Dyffryn Nantlle
  - The committee had to consider the clear objection of local residents
  - The development was bound to cause an adverse effect on the area
  - The noise effect from the removal of minerals would be harmful to a quiet, rural area
  - The development did not comply with local and national policies
  - Local people's quality of life must be protected
  - Hundreds of local residents were pleading with the committee to uphold and maintain the policies
  - There was no definite statement on employment in the application
  - The ability of the planning service to scrutinise the situation thoroughly must be considered and respected.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the agent representing the applicant made the following observations:
- An additional noise assessment had been undertaken along with two surveys to monitor the situation
  - This was small-scale extraction. Only 4 – 6 loads a day would leave the site. This was unlikely to create a harmful impact. Heavy lorries would not travel to the end of the track.
  - The proposal no longer included slate crushing.
  - The minerals would now be removed from the bottom of the tip and not the top.
  - The MT noise levels assessment should be accepted.
  - As common practice, several mitigation measures had been introduced.
- (ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak the local member (who was a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:
- A difficult application – supported both sides.
  - A local family wished to diversify their business using a resource on their land – it was difficult not to sympathise with them.
  - The community, particularly those residents who lived around the quarry, were concerned about the increased noise and dust that would result from the proposal.
  - Planning policies were at hand to deal with the situation, therefore the member recommended that the decision should be made based on those policies.
  - Proposed the need to hold constructive discussions when considering similar applications in the future – lessons should be learned in order to avoid a split in society.

The Senior Planning Service Manager added that the relevant policies must be taken into consideration, and highlighted the importance of consistency in decisions, and giving consideration to the observations of the Public Protection Service, which still objected to the proposal because of the detrimental effect it would have on neighbouring residents' residential amenities. He also emphasised that the Planning Committee had refused a

similar application only 12 months ago, and the Committee had to consider whether this application overcame the reasons for refusing the previous application. The main reason for refusing the application was the noise effect and the adverse effect on the area's visual amenities, which had been the main reason for refusing the previous application. He stressed therefore that the current application had not overcome the main reason for the refusal of the previous application, and if the application was approved contrary to the recommendation, the application would have to be referred to a cooling off period.

(d) Proposed – to refuse the application in line with the recommendation, and to have a registered vote.

(dd) During the ensuing discussion the following observations were made:

- Concern had been highlighted regarding the effect of noise, dust and transport in the area, especially for the residents of Talysarn. Residents' health and well-being must be taken into consideration.
- The report was comprehensive and provided clear guidance.
- There was enough slate aggregate in the area, therefore there was no demand for more.

In response to a question, the Senior Planning Manager – Minerals and Waste noted that 20 million tonnes of reserves in Gwynedd could be used as aggregate. He added that there was plenty of hard rock in reserve (which included slate).

- The development was on a post-industrial site and was an opportunity to create a business and boost the local economy.
- A new enterprise by a local farmer through diversification – the proposal must be welcomed if it provided work for local people.
- How could we be innovative if we refused businesses that would strengthen the economy?
- The Dolbebin Slate Tip could not offer anything different to what was offered by other local sites.
- The application must be weighed up carefully – we should not turn our countryside into a museum, but in this instance the effect on amenity outweighed the economic effect.
- One member made a request for confirmation that the Planning Service had not received a letter in his name.  
In response to the request the Solicitor confirmed that a letter had not been received.

**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, (10) Councillors: Endaf Cooke, Elwyn Edwards, Gwen Griffith, Anne T. Lloyd Jones, Dyfrig Wynn Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, June Marshall, W Tudor Owen, Eirwyn Williams and Gruffydd Williams**

**Against the proposal to refuse, (3) Councillors: John Pughe Roberts, Hefin Williams and Eurig Wyn.**

**Abstaining, (0)**

**RESOLVED to refuse the application**

1. **In terms of the local and regional need for the mineral, it is believed that there are enough slate reserves in Gwynedd and there is no obligation on the authority, in terms of the regional apportionment, to secure further reserves or allocations of slate waste. As a result, the development does not comply with National and Regional Planning Policy and Directive, nor does it comply with the requirements of policies C9, C10 and C15 of the Unitary Development Plan. In order to minimise the visual and environmental impact of mineral development in Dyffryn Nantlle, the authority would first need to consider extensions to the existing sites.**
2. **In the absence of specific plans and drawings for a phased scheme of restoration, aftercare and after use, it is believed that the proposal will have a detrimental effect on the area's visual amenities, both during the operational phase and once operations have ceased. To this end, the development does not comply with the requirements of policies B10, C9, C14 and C15 of the Unitary Development Plan or with national planning policy directive.**
3. **It is believed that the proposal, on its own or in combination with other mineral development operations in the area, is likely to have a detrimental impact on the area's amenities and is contrary to policy B23 of the UDP (amenities) and policy C12 (buffer zones).**

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

Upgrade an existing static caravan park and relocate it from part of field 472 to part of field 470.

- (a) The Senior Planning Service Manager expanded on the background of the application, noting that the application had been submitted to a meeting of the Planning Committee on 24 November 2014 where it was decided to approve the application contrary to the officers' recommendation. In light of the decision, there was a significant risk to the Council in respect of the decision to approve contrary to the officers' recommendation, therefore the matter was referred to a cooling off period in accordance with the Committee's standing orders. The purpose of reporting back to the Committee was to highlight the planning policy issues, the possible risks and to offer options for the Committee to consider before reaching a final decision.

The Members were reminded that the proposal would involve relocating a static caravan site to a new site, and exchanging the static caravans for twin static holiday caravans. It was emphasised that the area of the site was 4.96 hectares (namely field no. 470), and the surface area of the existing Gwynus caravan park which contained static and touring caravans was 1.69 hectares. It was also highlighted that it was proposed to create a new entrance and that the site was located within the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). It was noted that in terms of the principle of the application, Policy D17 was supportive of applications to upgrade static caravan sites through small extensions to the land area and by relocating static holiday caravan units from prominent settings to less prominent locations. The aim of this principle was to enable existing caravan sites which were located in visually prominent sites, especially within the AONB, to be relocated to less prominent sites and thus reduce the visual impact on the landscape.

It was not considered that the current planning application was eligible to be considered as a small extension, since the land area of the extension was 4.69 hectares compared with the current 1.69 hectares (the touring and static caravans), and compared with 0.19 hectares which was the land area of the static caravan site. In addition to this the proposal would

relocate static caravans from concealed locations to much more prominent settings. It was therefore emphasised that the application was unacceptable in principle and was completely contrary to Policy D17.

It was noted that due to the size of the application site, the separate vehicular access etc., it appeared that the proposal was tantamount to creating a new static caravan park. It was emphasised that this was contrary to the requirements of Policy D16 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan which stated that proposals to develop new sites for static holiday caravan units or holiday chalets would be refused. It must be noted that this policy had been implemented strictly within the Local Planning Authority since adopting the UDP.

It was emphasised that the site measured 4.96 hectares and was located within the AONB, and that it was the Committee's statutory duty to protect, maintain and enhance this area. The application meant relocating static caravans to much more prominent locations within the AONB, therefore it was contrary to policy B8.

If the application was approved, this would undermine the Council's policies, would create inconsistencies in how the Council operated and would set a possible precedent for other sites. It was noted that up to 200 other caravan parks were likely to be scrutinising this decision, and whilst every application must be determined on its own merits, there was also a need to ensure consistency in terms of applying the planning policies.

Three options were proposed for the Committee to consider in determining the application. The officers' firm recommendation was to refuse the application as it was completely contrary to the UDP.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:-
- The existing site was established in the late 50s / early 60s.
  - As the site was dispersed, it no longer met the appropriate standards, therefore the site must be altered in order to ensure that residents continued to use the site.
  - The golf course was no longer in operation, therefore this justified its consideration as Brownfield land.
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), supported the application and he made the following main points:-
- The caravan park was a family park and had existed for over 60 years
  - Field no. 472 was no longer suitable because of Health and Safety matters
  - The size of the extension corresponded with Health and Safety requirements, therefore this was the main reason for moving the 10 static caravans.
  - In terms of the operation of the site, it was important to keep the static caravans together.
  - Only a part of field 470 would be used.
  - Moving the caravans would mean that they were less visible from the road.
  - 250 trees had been planted to landscape the site and to reduce the visual effect, and to create a better environment for wildlife.
  - The proposed colour of the twin caravans blended in better with the landscape.
  - It would have been wise for the Committee to visit field no. 472 during their site visit.
  - Upgrading the site would keep the benefit local by boosting the economy in an area where unemployment was high.
  - It was intended to use local resources and local constructors.

The Chairman reiterated that thorough and serious consideration must be given to the content of the report.

- (ch) It was proposed to refuse the application and consider option 5.1 (ii), and to register the vote.

*'To refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation and suggest that the applicant discusses alternative upgrade options which would meet the requirements of the relevant planning policies and include a small extension which incorporates the existing site.'*

- (d) During the ensuing discussion the following observations were made by individual Members and responses were provided where appropriate:

- In response to a question regarding a transparent procedure for dealing with applications from Councillors and members of the Planning Committee, the Solicitor explained that this was a planning application before the Committee, and that the Committee must make a decision based on the relevant planning considerations and the relevant planning policies. He noted that the application raised significant concerns for the planning service and that those concerns had been highlighted in the cooling off report and in the Senior Manager's verbal report. Should the application be approved contrary to the recommendation, the committee would have to provide appropriate planning reasons, and it would be very difficult to have firm reasons to justify approving the application.
- Local and national policies must be adhered to. There were sufficient appropriate reasons for refusal here.
- The committee must consider the application, not the applicant. The report provided a full and adequate explanation to be able to assess the application.
- Approving would set a precedent for other caravan sites.  
It appeared that the planning service had over-emphasised the size of field 470. The application before the Committee was for relocating 10 caravans. In response, the solicitor confirmed that the land area of the planning application site was 4.96 hectares, and emphasised that the applicant had submitted this particular application, and this was the application to be considered by the Committee.
- Option 5.1 (ii) was proposed for considering the improvements required for the caravan park.

In response to a question on what was meant by 'alternative upgrade options' which was incorporated in option 5.1 (ii), the Senior Planning Service Manager expressed that the site could be upgraded through a scheme which satisfied the policies and Health and Safety conditions, but the applicant would need to hold discussions with the Service before submitting a further application and act on the advice provided by the Service.

- In terms of implementing option 5.1 (iii), the Senior Planning Service Manager stated that a section 106 agreement would be required in order to delete a planning permission that had been granted recently for relocating and upgrading static caravans.
- In response to a question regarding a decision being considered by the Ombudsman because that decision had been made in order to seek advantage. It was noted that this was a risk that had been highlighted in the cooling off report, and it was also noted that the decision could be subject to a judicial review.



**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, (11) Councillors: Craig ab Iago, Elwyn Edwards, Gwen Griffith, Anne T. Lloyd Jones, Dyfrig Wynn Jones, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Hefin Williams and Eurig Wyn.**

**Against the proposal to refuse, (2) Councillors: Endaf Cooke and Dilwyn Lloyd**

**Abstaining, (0)**

**Resolved: To refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation and suggest that the applicant discusses alternative upgrade options which would meet the requirements of the relevant planning policies and include a small extension which incorporates the existing site.**

- 1. The proposal would mean relocating the static caravan site in its entirety to a more prominent and visible position in the landscape and it is not considered that the site which is the subject of the application is a small extension to the existing site and, therefore, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policy D17 of the GUDP. Furthermore, and because of the size and the relationship of the proposal in the context of the existing site, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy D16 of the GUDP.**
- 2. It is considered that the proposed location would be more visible than the existing caravan site and consequently, it is not considered that the proposal would ensure that the character of the AONB is protected, maintained or enhanced and therefore the proposal would cause significant harm to the rural landscape of the AONB contrary to the requirements of Policy B8 of the GUDP.**
- 4. Application number C14/0745/25/HY – Land near Ffordd Penrhos, Penrhosgarnedd, Bangor**

A part-retrospective application for installing two stack advertisement boards.

- (a) The Development Control manager expanded on the background of the application, noting that the description of the application had been amended following objections to delete a v-shaped board mounted on flag poles. It was explained that planning guidelines restricted planning considerations on applications involving signs to public safety (e.g. roads) and visual amenities. The Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal on the grounds of road safety and it was not considered that the proposal was likely to have a detrimental effect on safety on roads and streets. It was also considered that the signs, given their location and the development they were advertising, were acceptable in respect of the visual effect.

It was explained that the proposal involved providing a stack advertisement board (measuring 3 metres high and 3 metres wide) on both sides of the site entrance, advertising a housing development that had been permitted and which was being developed. It was noted that the applicant was requesting permission to site the signs until 1.08.2019 and that consideration should be given to including this as a condition.

(b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:

- A number of the development company's actions had been contrary to custom, and their actions should be monitored, ensuring that they kept to their word.
- The developers needed to improve their communication with the community.
- Accepted that the flag poles had been taken down
- One of the signs caused visual harm to a nearby property

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

(ch) During the ensuing discussion the following observations were made:

- Need to ensure that the signs were bilingual
- Suggest permission for a year only
- Need to ensure that the company adhered to guidelines

**Resolved: To approve the application subject to the following conditions:**

1. **The development to be completed in accordance with the plans submitted on 14.10.2014**
2. **Advertisements must be maintained and they must be in a safe, clean and orderly condition to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority.**
3. **Temporary permission only – until 01.08.19**

**5. Application number C14/0885/33/LL – Tyddyn Cae, Boduan, Pwllheli.**

Installation and operation of a solar farm (4.9MW) along with associated infrastructure including PV panels, mounting frames, an inverter, transformer, pole-mounted CCTV cameras, fencing and sub-stations.

(a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application, noting that the proposal involved installing solar panels to create a solar park. The original proposal had been to generate 9MW of electricity for the National Grid, but the application had now been reduced in size to generate 4.9MW of electricity. It was also noted that one additional letter of objection had been received.

Reference was made to policy C27 of the Unitary Development Plan which related to renewable and sustainable energy schemes.

The site was located within the Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest, and the Boduan Historic Park and Garden was located approximately 250 metres to the west. The Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) was located approximately 1.5km to the north-west. It was explained that there were mature trees, hedgerows and *cloddiau* around and within the site, and it was not considered that the proposal would have a substantial effect on the AONB. It appeared that the entire scheme was visible from one place, and because the proposal had been reduced substantially, it was considered acceptable and suitable for the location in question.

It was noted that the buildings that were included as part of the application were to be located near the existing farm buildings. It was highlighted that some buildings were to be sited on the fields near the solar panels, and it was suggested that a condition could be imposed to ensure

that these buildings were green coloured and of a material that reflected the agricultural buildings seen around the area.

During the construction phase it was noted that there would be a notable increase in traffic flow, and the applicant had submitted plans to deal with this. Reference was made to the Transportation Unit's observation that an assessment should be undertaken of the condition of the road and the bridge, during and at the end of the work. The officer drew attention to the observation by the Gwynedd Archaeology Planning Service which recommended a further evaluation before determining the application – the Service had identified the potential for archaeological remains on the site.

It was suggested that additional conditions should be imposed – locate the panels in accordance with the plans, a plan for controlling the flow and times of work-related traffic, and subject to receiving favourable observations on Archaeology matters, it was considered that the development complied with the UDP.

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

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

- The application corresponded to national and local policies
- It was confirmed that the proposal's capacity was 4.9MW, and not 9MW as in the original application
- As a result of a substantial reduction in the size of the proposal, the layout had been revised
- A reduction in size meant a reduction in the number of vehicles visiting the site during the construction phase
- There was no loss of agricultural land – sheep would continue to graze on the land
- The archaeological evaluation would be received soon
- Commitment with the community had been good – only five objections had been received
- There were good benefits available to the community

(ch) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:

- Concern about a substantial increase in vehicles over the construction phase
- Stone walls were a typical feature of the area
- Rural lanes were narrow and winding, which would be difficult for large vehicles to navigate.
- A request by a family who lived nearby to move some of the panels which would cause a visual impact
- A request to consider a new access from Pwllheli road
- Need to reconcile information with regard to the size of the proposal. It must be ensured that 4.9MW was advertised on the internet, not 9MW.
- Include an additional condition to ensure that the company adheres to 4.9MW in accordance with the application submitted.
- Information must be obtained from the Archaeology Service in order to ensure that the application was complete and in accordance with policy B7.
- Proposed that the Committee visited the site.

**RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.**

## **6. Application number C14/0902/39/LL – 75, Cae Du, Abersoch.**

Demolish current garage and erect a new garage with balcony above, two-storey extension on the north side, erect new retaining walls, alterations and renovation.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application, noting that substantial improvements had been made to the plan since it had been submitted. It was noted that planning permission already existed for a two-storey extension and for changing the use of the garage (the applicant had the right to implement this permission until September 2016). Even so, it was noted that the aim of the application at hand was more suitable.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was generally noted that policies B22 and B24 of the Unitary Development Plan approved proposals to extend existing dwellings, provided they complied with associated criteria that aimed at safeguarding the recognised features and character of the landscape and environment, together with the character and amenity value of the local area. It was not considered that the proposal would affect the area's visual amenities or the character of the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and the design of the extension was considered acceptable.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and he made the following main points:-
- That the extension was likely to affect the amenities of residents who lived in the neighbouring bungalows
  - Concern of overdevelopment in the estate
  - The residents who already lived there had to be considered
  - The aim of the extension was investment
- (c) Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.

**Resolved: To approve the application subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Commencement within five years.**
  2. **In accordance with the revised plan.**
  3. **Slates to match those of the existing property.**
  4. **Agree on the finish of the external walls.**
  5. **Obscured glass in the window at the top of the stairs on the western elevation.**
  6. **Agree on local natural stone to face the new retaining wall at the front of the property.**
7. **Application no. C14/1042/11/LL – Tŷ Cegin, Rhodfa Penrhyn, Maesgeirchen, Bangor**

Construct five houses to include two semi-detached houses and three terraced houses and create a new vehicular access.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application and noted that the application site was located within the expansive Maesgeirchen estate on the outskirts of Bangor city, but within the city's development boundaries as defined in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan. The site was considered suitable for development and the proposal was considered acceptable in terms of satisfying the local need for housing.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was generally noted that the site responded to the requirements of policy C1 (promote development within development boundaries). In terms of policy B11, it was not anticipated that the proposal would cause significant harm to open spaces as the site was not of ecological value nor did it add to

the visual range for local residents. It was noted that the open space was occasionally used by Tŷ Cegin users for activities, but other nearby green open spaces had been identified which could be used.

It was noted it was intended to create a new access to the site and consequently there was a need to move the traffic calming tortoise that was located on the highway and outside the application site. It was reported that the Transportation Unit was satisfied with the location of the entrance but not with the proposed location of the traffic calming tortoise. It was highlighted that discussions regarding the entrance were ongoing but it was considered that the development conformed with the Unitary Development Plan.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:
- That the application responded to housing needs in Maesgeirchen (specifically to the need for two-bedroom houses)
  - That the development created a suitable location within the community
  - The applicant had consulted with the community regarding losing green space, but other specific green spaces were available closeby.
  - That sufficient parking spaces were included in the plan.
  - That the plan had received the support of Bangor City Council
  - In terms of letting plans, the applicant would work with the community.
- (c) Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.

**Resolved: To delegate the power to the Senior Planning Manger to approve the application subject to receipt of further plans from the applicant and confirmation from the Transportation Unit that the new access is acceptable.**

**Conditions -**

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Slate
4. Materials
5. Landscaping
6. Removal of permitted development rights
7. Highways

**8. Application no. C14/1043/11/LL – Tan y Bryn Road, Maesgeirchen, Bangor**

To erect 6 new two-storey dwellings in the form of two blocks of three two-bedroom terraced houses with associated gardens and parking spaces.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application, noting that it was a follow up to application C14/1042/11/LL; in a site located within Bangor city's development boundaries and within the expansive Maesgeirchen estate. It was noted that the site had recently been cleared of structures that previously existed there, and therefore the principle of re-developing suitable sites like this was considered acceptable and that it conformed to the requirements of relevant local and national policies and guidelines.

It was explained that this proposal would involve a relatively traditional development in terms of its form and layout with gardens to the front and rear. There was no uniform pattern to the houses in the neighbouring area and therefore it was not considered that there would be an impact on the nearby residents' visual amenities. The brownfield site was considered suitable for development, and the proposal was considered acceptable in terms of satisfying the local need for affordable housing.

Regarding transport and access issues, the Transportation Unit had requested confirmation of what was intended to be done to a part of Lôn y Parc, the road which ran past the front of the site. The plan showed an intention to diverge part of the road, but sufficient information had not been submitted. It was considered that the application complied with the UDP.

- (b) Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:
  - That the application responded to the need for two-bedroom houses in Maesgeirchen
  - That old garages existed on the site previously that had now been demolished as there was no demand for them.
- (ch) Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.
- (d) During the discussion, the following observations were made:
  - That the distribution of gardens seemed unfair
  - That the plan responded to the needs of the Gwynedd Local Development Plan
  - Was there a condition 106 on the houses?
- (dd) In response to the observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that:
  - CCG needed to consider the distribution of gardens when letting the houses
  - The development was within the boundary of the Local Development Plan and satisfied identified needs

**Resolved: To delegate the power to the Senior Planning Manger to approve the application subject to receipt of further details from the applicant regarding the arrangements for Lôn y Parc and receiving confirmation from the Transportation Unit that these arrangements are acceptable.**

**Conditions -**

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Slate
4. Materials
5. Landscaping
6. Removal of permitted development rights
7. Highways

**9. Application No. C4/1065/42/LL – Ty'n y Coed Touring Park, Morfa Nefyn, Pwllheli**

Locate 7 new touring caravan pitches on the existing site and extend the site to locate 14 touring caravan pitches along with improvements to the site entrance, landscaping and associated works.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application, noting that the application had been submitted to the Committee as it was a development of 5 or more caravans. It was noted that no objection to the plan had been received. Reference was made to policy D20 which approved proposals to increase the number of pitches, extensions to sites, relocation or exchange of pitches if the proposal ensured environmental and visual improvements, and met other criteria regarding the impact of the development on the local area. It was highlighted that the site had been landscaped well along the boundaries with mature hedges and trees, and the additional landscaping would lead to environmental improvements which would contribute positively to its setting and appearance in the landscape.

It was believed that the site was also suitable to receive additional units, and it was not considered that there would be damage to nearby residents' amenities in light of the application, bearing in mind that the site was close to a county road.

- (b) Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.
- (c) During the discussion, the following observations were made:
- That there was a lack of touring sites in Gwynedd
  - Concern that the proposal was an over-development
- (ch) In response to an observation regarding concerns of over-development, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the officers had weighed up this issue with all the other relevant planning issues, it was considered that the application conformed to the UDP.

**Resolved: To approve subject to conditions:**

1. **Five years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Restrict the numbers**
4. **Restrict operation**
5. **Time period / touring only**
6. **Holiday only**
7. **Keep a register**
8. **Landscaping**
9. **Protect public footpaths**
10. **No storing**

**10. Application no. C14/1083/42/LL – Tu Hwnt i'r Ffrwd, Morfa Nefyn, Pwllheli**

Change of use to include 16 additional touring caravans including a road and hard standings

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background of the application, noting that the application had been submitted to the Committee as it involved a development of 5 or more caravans. It was highlighted that the application was a re-submission of an application that was refused by the Planning Committee in October 2013, as the extension would stand out as an obvious and intrusive feature in the countryside.

It was noted that the field in question was adjacent to a field that had been granted planning permission for 14 touring units. The toilet blocks which formed part of that application had already been erected, but the caravan use had not yet been implemented. As well as this, planning permission had been granted to site 11 touring caravans and hard standings on a field below. The 16 caravans included in the application at hand would therefore be in addition to the 25 caravans that have already been permitted on the site, which would come to a total of 41 units.

It seemed that the applicant had commenced on the landscaping work since submitting the application. This had not yet had the opportunity to mature and the field continued to be open and visible in the landscape. It was highlighted that there was an intention to create new '*cloddiau*' to separate the rows of caravans along with planting work in the corners of the field. Concern was noted about the visual impact of the proposal, that was close to the Landscape Conservation Area and the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty designation, and there was no conviction that the proposal led to visual improvements that would improve the site itself or the surrounding environment and therefore the principles of policy D20 were not met.

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

- That permission to a similar site had already been given
- That the site stood away from the B4412 and was not within a 'sensitive' area
- That the applicant had chosen to re-design the landscape by carefully considering the plants
- The economic benefit should be addressed - the applicant had already invested money in to the site using local builders and resources
- Tourism was the driving force for Gwynedd's economy and therefore the application should be addressed and appreciated.

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

- That the applicant had been born and bred on the site
- That the applicant had already received conditions to applications in terms of facilities that were needed to serve the site, but the applicant had not opened the caravan site as he was keeping to the rules
- The applicant had built a '*clawdd*' over 6 foot tall that was not reflected in the slides/presentation. The '*cloddiau*' were not built with twigs, but with indigenous hazel trees with seeds that were collected locally. Hazel trees were a species that were a special local feature to Llŷn's hedges
- The field was not visible as it was in a dip in the land
- Support for the enterprise by local businesses, aware that visitors would come to the site and boost the local economy
- The applicant was a very responsible caravan site owner

**RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.**

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 4.20 pm.