

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 28/09/15

---

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

**Councillors:** Elwyn Edwards, Simon Glyn, Gwen Griffith, Dyfrig Wynn Jones, Eric M. Jones (substitute), June Marshall, W. Tudor Owen, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams, Owain Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Others invited:** Councillors Aled Ll. Evans and Sion Wyn Jones (Local members).

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), Glyn Llewelyn Gruffydd (Senior Development Control Officer), Rhun ap Iarad (Senior Solicitor) and Bethan Adams (Member Support and Scrutiny Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillors Endaf Cooke, Dilwyn Lloyd (substitute), John Pughe Roberts and Councillors D.Gwynfor Edwards and Sian Gwenllian (Local Members).

### 1. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

A new member of the Committee, Councillor Simon Glyn, who was attending his first meeting was welcomed.

The Chair referred to the late Councillor Robert J. Wright and noted that a tribute would be made in his honour at the Council's meeting on 8 October 2015.

The members stood as a mark of respect.

### 2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

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 C15/0282/45/LL);
- Councillor Aled Ll. Evans, (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda, (planning applications number C15/0421/41/LL and C15/0751/41/LL);
- Councillor Eirwyn Williams (a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C15/0429/35/LL);
- Councillor Siôn Wyn Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda, (planning application number C15/0757/18/LL);
- Councillor Elwyn Edwards, (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C15/0517/04/LL).

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

### 3. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee held on 07.09.15, as a true record.

#### 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 C13/1298/11/AM – Land near Lôn Pobty, Bangor

Full application for the construction of a two-storey building providing 18 self-contained units for students, felling trees protected by a tree preservation order, amendments to existing vehicular access together with creating a new access for pedestrians and landscaping.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the application site was located within the residential area on the outskirts of the city of Bangor.

Members' attention was drawn to the tables in the report that indicated the latest situation (September 2015) in terms of private purpose-built student accommodation developments in Bangor. It was noted that the information highlighted that not all student accommodation needs were being addressed by purpose-built student accommodation. Reference was made to an appeal decision on an application to provide student accommodation on the former Jewson site, Bangor, where the Inspector has noted that 'there was an obvious need to provide more student accommodation in Bangor'.

It was considered that a clear need existed for purpose-built student accommodation developments, and this type of development had the potential of having a positive impact on the local housing market as it could free up houses of multiple occupation to be used by local households that needed such housing and that it provided quality facilities for students and was formally regulated.

It was noted that the report recommended that the Committee should delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application subject to signing a 106 Agreement regarding a financial contribution to improve and maintain an open play area. It was reported that in order to ensure consistency in relation to applications for purpose-built student accommodation it was not considered reasonable to ask for such a contribution as it was believed that the University's sports provision currently responded to these needs.

Reference was made to objections received on grounds of road safety, access and increase in traffic. It was noted that the proposal involved improving the existing access and four parking spaces would be provided along with turning space for vehicles within the building's curtilage. It was added that having received a revised plan demonstrating the layout of the nearby roads and pavements, the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal.

The development complied with the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan (GUDP) for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:-
- That she lived in the listed building opposite the site and was speaking on behalf of the community;

- That the local community was trying to adjust to the student accommodation development on the former St Mary's site, and that this development would be a step too far;
- That a number of applications had been submitted over the years for this site, and the most recent application in 1990 had been refused on appeal due to safety concerns relating to the access and the impact on the setting of the listed building;
- That the Design and Access Statement submitted as part of the application noted that access would be gained to the site from Lôn Bopty, however the access road would be from Bishops Mill Road, namely a steep single lane road with one turning space.
- The changes to the access in Lôn Bopty would improve visibility to some degree, however it would not improve access to the site;
- That the proposal did not comply with policies CH33 or D19 of the GUDP;
- Smaller vehicles were dispatched to collect waste along the road as it was narrow;
- The development would affect the setting of the listed building;
- Should the application be approved, it would affect the privacy and the peace and quiet of residents;
- Lôn Bopty currently received little natural light, and the development would add to this;
- There was a Tree Preservation Order on the site;
- There were bats and slow worm present on the site;
- The development would not meet the area's needs.

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

- The development site was within the development boundary;
- There was a need for student accommodation as noted in the Inspector's appeal decision in relation to the application for 110-114 High Street, Bangor.
- That the number of units had been reduced from 32 to 18;
- The design of the building had been revised;
- The building would be located at a sufficient distance from the listed building;
- The Transportation Unit was satisfied with the proposed access improvements;
- The original application had been revised to ensure that the development was acceptable.

(ch) A member noted that she had received an e-mail from the Local Member who noted that he had welcomed the development on the former St. Mary's site, but that he objected to this development due to the pressure on the community relating to parking and refuse collection arrangements. He was of the opinion that there was no need for more student provision in this area.

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

- there was clear evidence in terms of the need for purpose-built student accommodation;
- that the original scheme had been substantially revised and reduced.

Proposed and seconded to approve the application.

(d) In response to a comment by a member regarding the need for purpose-built student accommodation, the Development Control Manager noted that there was a lack of provision for half of the University's students.

A member proposed that the application should be postponed in order to undertake a site visit as previous planning applications on the site had been refused due to the site access.

**RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.**

**2. Application no C14/1222/30/LL – Bryn Gwynt, Anelog, Aberdaron**

Use of exempted Camping and Caravanning Club site as an independent site for ten seasonal touring caravans and five tents

- (a) It was reported that a request had been received from the applicant's agent to postpone a discussion on the application in order to undertake further discussions.

**RESOLVED to defer the application.**

**3. Application no C15/0282/45/LL – Villa Fioretta, Ala Road, Pwllheli**

The discussion on the above application was chaired by the Vice-chair.

Construction of a dwelling with attached garage and formation of access and parking / turning area along with associated work

- (a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the site was within a C1 flood zone. It was reported that an amended flood consequence assessment had been received after receiving confirmation from Gwynedd Consultancy that the watercourse on the site was still operational. It was noted that the proposal now intended to realign the watercourse approximately 5 metres further towards the western boundary of the site and for the new watercourse to leave the site in the current location following concerns expressed by Natural Resources Wales (NRW).

Attention was drawn to the fact that observations had been received from the Biodiversity Unit noting that there were no biodiversity concerns.

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

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted his appreciation of the officers' work and his hope that the Committee would approve the application.
- (c) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:-
- That it should be ensured in light of NRW's concerns that the watercourse exited the site in the current location;
  - That it was reasonable enough to include a condition that a brick of suitable colour, other than red, should be used on the plinth, as it was not characteristic of the area and there was a need for the building to blend in with the area's architecture;
  - That the conditions and the recommendations relating to installing a 1.7 metre high privacy screen on the eastern and western sides of the balcony at all times, and not installing any additional windows apart from those shown in the plans was of crucial importance in order to address privacy concerns.
  - It was crucial that the house's finished floor level was no lower than 4.717mAOD due to the site's location;
  - Realigning the watercourse would safeguard houses surrounding the site in light of the flood risk.

- (ch) Proposed and seconded to approve the application.

In response to a query by a member regarding the realignment of the watercourse, the Development Control Manager noted that the applicant would have to make a formal application, outside the planning system, to do this, but she anticipated that there would be no problems.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Commence within five years
2. In line with the amended plans received 24 July 2015.
3. Slates on the roof
4. Agree on the finish of the external walls, including the brick colour.
5. Privacy screen measuring 1.7 metres of height to be located on the western and eastern side of the balcony at all times.
6. No other windows (apart from those shown on the plan)
7. Landscaping.
8. Finished floor level to be no lower than 4.717mAOD.
9. Parking and turning spaces to be in operation before the property is occupied for the first time.
10. Welsh Water conditions in relation to the drainage of surface water, foul water and land drainage.
11. Construction hours restricted to 08.00 - 18.00 Monday to Friday, 08.00 - 13.00 on Saturday and not at all on Sunday or Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed upon beforehand with the Local Planning Authority.

Note - Need to re-locate the watercourse before work on the remainder of the development is to commence.

**4. Application No C15/0421/41/LL – Llety Plu, Llangybi, Pwllheli**

Extension to existing garage (amendment to plan that was refused under application number C15/0012/41/LL).

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

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 7 September, 2015 in order to undertake a site visit.

It was noted that it was considered that a further extension to the garage would create a building of a scale and design that would be alien to the location in respect of such an ancillary building and it would be an incompatible overdevelopment of the site.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the application was located within the Llangybi Area of Conservation and it was not considered that the scale, size or form of the extension would be in keeping with buildings or pattern of the conservation area.

It was noted that the proposal was contrary to policies B4, B22 and B24 of the GUDP.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:-
- That he appreciated having a site visit;
  - That describing the development as an 'alien' 'over-development' was rather going overboard;
  - The area of the house was sufficient to accommodate the size of the garage extension;
  - That no objection had been received from neighbours;
  - The curtilage had already been extended;

- The purpose of the building was to provide more room for the applicant to store equipment and old machines;
- That the development would not affect the area of conservation;
- He hoped that the application would be approved.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

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

- No objections had been received to the proposal and that its size was a matter of opinion;
- There were no signs to denote the path that ran past the site as a public footpath, and should it be approved, there was a need to ensure that such a sign was erected there;
- Currently, the public footpath was not accessible to disabled people and the proposed extension would be nearer to the path;
- The applicant needed a building of this size to restore old furniture, which was crucial to secure the continuation and to safeguard tradition;
- Concern in terms of the size of the building after completing the proposed extension;
- That a large extension had already been approved and the proposed extension would be an overdevelopment.

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

- Previous planning applications had been supported and this was seen as a fragmented attempt to create an extension of increasing size;
- That the extension approved under application C13/0162/41/LL meant that the total floor area of the garage would be 62m<sup>2</sup> and it was assumed that it would be sufficient for use that was ancillary to the use of the property;
- The proposed extension would not be in keeping with the conservation area as it would be very visible;
- There was a need for extensions to be commensurate with the original building and they needed to respect the location;
- That signs denoting the public footpath had been present in the past and discussions were being held with the Rights of Way Unit in terms of whether or not the development would affect the path.

(d) A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse the application and it fell.

Proposed and seconded to approve the application contrary to the officers' recommendation as the visual impact was acceptable.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. In accordance with the plans
3. Slate
4. Materials to be in-keeping
5. No business use of the building as a whole
6. Keep the public footpath clear

**5. Application No C15/0429/35/LL – Llwyn Madyn, Muriau, Cricieth**

First floor extension including raising the roof level, creation of balcony and changes to fenestration (re-submission following the refusal of planning permission C14/1152/35/LL).

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

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 27 July, 2015 in order to hold a site visit.

It was noted that the proposed extension would create a house that would be substantially larger than the current property in a housing estate dominated by bungalows and dormer bungalows, therefore it was not considered that the size, volume and height of the building in its new guise would respect the scale, appearance or developed form of the nearby townscape and it would create a prominent and incompatible feature in this fairly uniform estate.

It was noted that it was considered that the proposed design, due to its height and volume, would create an obtrusive element that would dominate the views in this part of the estate and that it would be an unacceptable and incompatible intrusion in the local residential pattern.

- (b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:-
- That he appreciated having a site visit;
  - The Town Council had no objection to the plan, neither did nearby residents;
  - The report noted that the site was in a prominent location on the junction between two public roads and not many people used this road, therefore there would be no visual impact.
  - When finished, the development would only be 1 metre taller than the adjacent house.

Proposed and seconded to approve the application contrary to the officers' recommendation as the visual impact was acceptable.

- (c) During the discussion, the following main observations were made:
- The estate had a cross-section of different houses;
  - Other houses in the estate had extensions;
  - The Town Council had no objection to the plan, neither did nearby residents;
  - There would be no overlooking from the rear of the extension and it would blend in with the estate;
  - There would be little difference in terms of the extension's height and the nearby house;
  - There was a need to retain the estate's character, therefore the application should be refused in accordance with the officers' recommendation.
- (ch) In response to the above observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that although the design of the extension was of a good standard, it was considered that it would create a prominent and incompatible feature in this relatively uniform estate.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. In accordance with the plans
3. Slate
4. Materials to be agreed
5. Removal of PD rights – windows
6. Construction hours restricted to 08.00 - 18.00 Monday to Friday, 08.00 - 13.00 on Saturday and not at all on Sunday or Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed upon beforehand with the Local Planning Authority.

## 6. Application no C15/0751/41/LL – Fferm Bryn Bachau, Chwilog

Installation of ground mounted photovoltaic energy (pv) system of up to 4.42 MW on 14.22 ha of agricultural land and associated works including two sub-station buildings, security fencing and transformer structures.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the site was in open countryside on undulating land located between the higher ground of central Llŷn and Cardigan Bay and the site's field along with other fields in the area were surrounded by 'cloddiau' and hedgerows.

It was noted that it was considered that the principle of the proposal was acceptable in terms of policies C1, C27 and C28 of the GUDP and that it coincided with Strategic Policy 9 relating to the provision of energy from renewable sources.

Attention was drawn to the objections received from the owner of a nearby farmhouse which mainly related to the impact on the landscape and views from the property. In accepting that it is possible that parts of the site will be visible from the property, due to the landform, current vegetation and the distance between the property and the site, more than 360m, it is not believed that the development would be obtrusive for the occupants of the farmhouse or that its impact on the landscape would be harmful enough to justify refusing the application.

Attention was drawn to the solar panel location plan which was circulated to the members at the meeting along with additional observations that had been received noting that the Tree Officer had noted that an ancient grey willow tree growing on the site and it was recommended that a condition should be included stipulating that the tree must be protected during the development process.

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

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:-
- That their family farm was located near the application site, and whilst they supported solar developments, they were of the opinion that they should be installed on building roofs, rather than on land;
  - The Community Council was not aware of their concerns;
  - The members should visit the site;
  - Field 2 was located on a hill and looked down on their farm;
  - Planting trees was not an appropriate response in terms of screening;
  - Their concern in terms of the scale and size of the development that would equate to 15 football pitches;
  - The land would be industrial rather than agricultural if the application was approved;
  - There would be an impact on the amenities of the farm due to glint in addition to the increased risk of accidents.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- That the report was an extensive assessment of the application and he concurred with the conclusions;
  - The development would not cause significant visual impact;
  - The land where it was intended to locate the development had been classed as grade 4 and 5, therefore the land lost would not be valuable agricultural land;
  - The proposal was not contrary to any policy;
  - He respected the opinion of the objector, however, the relevant matters had been considered in the assessment;

- Some parts of the development would be visible from other locations, but an attempt had been made to select the fields that would have least impact and it was intended to add to the mature screen of trees and hedges along the western boundary of the development;
- A letter of support was received from the representatives of Hafan y Môr and should the application be approved, they would hold discussions with the family in relation to meeting its green energy requirements.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

(ch) The following observations were noted in favour of the recommendation:

- That the application met the requirements and it was of crucial importance to maintain industry in the countryside and to reach a compromise in terms of protecting the landscape and securing economic prosperity;
- That visual impact was subjective;
- That the way in which renewable energy developments were being funded would change at the end of the month, unless development had already received planning permission;
- Although they could sympathise with the objector, they supported the proposal as the application site was located near an electricity sub-station;
- That there was a local prospective buyer for the energy generated;
- Renewable energy developments were important given our over-reliance on oil and gas;
- That numerous international studies had shown that there was no impact on tourism.

(d) The following observations were noted contrary to the recommendation:

- It was explained that the application had been submitted by Gwynedd Council (Pen Llŷn a'r Sarnau Special Area of Conservation).
- It was noted that the development would not be seen much from the highway, but this had also been noted when the application for Parciau Farm, Griffiths Crossing, Caernarfon was being determined, which was visible from the highway.
- The development could not create local employment;
- The impact on the nearby farmhouse was unacceptable;
- Did not agree with green energy and the way it was funded;
- The development would cause a visual impact;
- That no impact assessment of this kind of energy on the landscape, as done with wind turbines, had been undertaken and there was a danger of setting a precedent for future applications without knowing the impact;
- The size of the plan and its impact on the landscape

(dd) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:-

- An assessment of this proposal in terms of the effect on protected species, trees and local amenities is a relevant consideration, and worthy consideration was given to this element in determining the application.
- Unlike on-shore wind energy, no Supplementary Planning Guidance had been submitted for solar energy, however; the Gillespies company had recently been appointed to assess the sensitivity and capacity of the landscape in accommodating specific types of development;
- There was robust evidence of the capacity for such developments and the GUDP supports solar developments that are smaller than 5 MW;
- With regard to such applications in future, there was a need to reach a decision on this application by considering the current evidence and such considerations relating to the cumulative impact of these type of developments would be done when other applications were submitted;

- There was an attempt to mitigate the visual impact.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. To complete the development in accordance with the plans
3. The panels must be located as shown in the plans, or as agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.
4. Agree on the materials/colour of the frames and anti-glare covers
5. To agree on the colour of the fence and camera poles
6. Agree and complete a landscaping plan and a landscape management plan
7. Agree on and implement a Surface Water Management Plan and a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
8. Agree on and implement a Biodiversity Management Plan and a Biosafety Risk Assessment.
9. Agree on and implement a Traffic Flow Management Plan for the works
10. Agree on and implement an Archaeological Works Programme
11. Any electricity cables from the development to link to the electricity connection should be installed underground, and this should be agreed beforehand with the Local Planning Authority.
12. Within 25 years of completing the development or if the solar panels approved in this application remain unused for the purposes of generating electricity for 12 months, they must be permanently removed from the land and the site should be restored to its original condition
13. Welsh Water standard conditions
14. Agree on the external materials of all buildings
15. Highways conditions.
16. The details of the site's lighting system, including the type, exact location, luminosity level and the method of protection from pollution or light overflow must be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for written approval and to be fully operational before the permitted development is completed and before the site is operational.
17. Safeguard the ancient grey willow tree on the site.

**7. Application C15/0757/18/LL – Llain y Rhos, 2 Parc y Wern, Bethel**

Erection of side extension.

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the background of the application noting that the proposal had been amended since its original submission by removing windows from the extension's rear gable-end and including Velux windows within the new roof, the internal layout of the extension's first floor had also been changed by removing one bedroom, however, the surface area of the proposed extension remained the same.

It was noted that reference had been made to concerns about the scale and volume of the proposed extension, compared with the existing property in the Service's formal response to a pre-application enquiry and there was a need to reduce the size of the proposed extension in order to satisfy the requirements of relevant policies. However; it was added that the proposal had been submitted in the same form as the pre-application enquiry (without any change) and it is considered that the proposal appears to be an incompatible feature with the existing property.

It was acknowledged that there were relatively similar developments within the local area; however, it was not believed that the situation was the same, namely the nature and form of the existing property and its relationship with the parallel property. It was noted that the

proposal was unacceptable in terms of Policy B23 of the GUDP as it would cause significant damage to the amenities of the local neighbourhood by overdeveloping the site.

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

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's partner noted the following main points:-
- That she and her children lived in a rented house and they wished to live with her partner and his children in the house in question;
  - That the house in Bethel did not meet their needs, therefore, extending the house was their only option;
  - That her family were part of the community and she wanted this to continue;
  - That a letter of support had been received by their neighbours;
  - That Llanddeiniolen Community Council supported the application.
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:-
- That the house was not in a sensitive location and that applications for houses had been approved in the past in open countryside;
  - Neighbours, Llanddeiniolen Community Council and the community supported the proposal;
  - Four bedroom houses in Bethel would cost approximately £230,000 and therefore having an extension was the only option;
  - There was a need to support young people to enable them to remain in their communities;
  - The original plan had been amended by moving the location of the window on the rear of the proposed extension due to concerns of overlooking;
  - The maintenance of the Welsh language could be secured in the village by approving the application;
  - That he understood the officers' opinion, however there was a need to be flexible to local needs.

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

- (ch) During the discussion, the following main observations were made:
- That the proposal was not an over-development
  - That the design was acceptable and the extension would be in keeping;
  - An opportunity to support the Local Member and local young people by approving the application;
  - It was acknowledged that the extension was large when compared with the original house, however a smaller extension would not meet the needs of the family;
  - There was already a high density of houses in the area and the extension would not have an impact;
  - Special circumstances to approve the application as the area would lose a family should the application be refused;
  - That policies worked against local people;
  - Personal matters should not be a consideration and approving the extension would mean that the value of the property would be beyond the reach of individuals in future.
- (d) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that:-
- There was no justification to approving the application in terms of who lived at the property;

- That the matters in question were purely related to design;
- That the policies supported developments that reached the required criteria and there was a need for the extension to respect the size and scale of the existing property.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. In accordance with the plans
3. Removal of PD rights – windows
4. Slate
5. Materials to be agreed

**8. Application no C15/0760/20/LL – Laurence House, Tafarngrisiau Estate, Felinheli**

Erection of extensions to create an additional self-contained flat.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the proposal was to construct two extensions, one on the side elevation and the other on the building's rear elevation to provide a bedroom for the existing ground floor flat and to enable another section of the ground floor to form a separate flat.

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

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points in terms of the objections received:-
- That the embankment would stay;
  - That the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal;
  - There would be space to park two additional cars and turning space would be provided;
  - That the extension was small and would be three metres lower than the houses of Tafarngrisiau therefore there would be no impact on the sunlight the houses received in the evenings.
- (c) It was noted that the Local Member did not object to the application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. Complete in accordance with the plans
3. Agree on external materials
4. Slates on the pitched roof
5. The parking spaces must be completed prior to occupying the additional living unit hereby permitted

Welsh Water Note, Party Wall

**9. Application no C15/0517/04/LL – Coed y Foel Uchaf, Frongoch**

Installation of a wind turbine measuring 30.5m to the hub (48.01m to the tip of the blades) with a control box and associated works (resubmission of application previously withdrawn).

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the site was located on elevated land near the A4212 road which ran as the main link between the town of Bala and the village of Trawsfynydd.

It was noted that the proposed structure would be tall and manmade and would stand alone on high ground and the site would be visible from various perspectives in the neighbouring area and beyond, the turbine would be particularly visible whilst travelling along the A4212 down the valley to the direction of the site from the west. This would be due to its elevated and prominent location on the skyline from near and distant views in and out of the National Park. It was considered that the impact on the area's visual amenities would be substantial, and although electricity pylons were located to the south of the site, it was not considered that this would alleviate the detrimental impact of the development on the rural character and landscape of the area as it was a substantial, moving structure that would stand isolated.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the application site was close to the boundary of the Snowdonia National Park and that SNP's objection to the development noted that there would be an impact on views within the Park boundaries. It was considered, due to the prominence of the development within the landscape and from a vast area within the Park that it would significantly affect the enjoyment of users of the National Park.

Additionally, it was noted that officers had not been convinced that the proposal was a valid diversification activity and that this had been supported by recent appeal decisions on applications for turbines on other sites within the County.

It was noted that it was considered that the proposal did not meet the requirements of the relevant policies, and that the turbine would have a significant and substantial impact on the features and special character of the National Park.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, a supporter of the application noted the following main points:-
- That the application site was part-industrial with two rows of pylons on the site that were taller than the wind turbine;
  - The turbine would only be visible from the road for 1.5 miles when travelling to the direction of Bala;
  - The tourism period was brief and that the argument in terms of the impact on tourism was ambiguous;
  - The applicant intended to make financial contributions to different community entities for a 20 year period and if possible, a condition should be included to ensure this.
- (c) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:-
- That the objections of the Snowdonia National Park had come from an officer, rather than from a meeting of the Authority;
  - That the impact on the views was a matter of opinion;
  - There were two rows of pylons in the area and some were as high as 47 metres, therefore the turbine would not add to the impact on the landscape;
  - That Llanderfel Community Council supported the application;
  - Neither Natural Resources Wales nor CADW objected to the proposal;
  - Wind turbine developments did not affect tourism;
  - Three turbines had already been approved near the river bank;
  - That financial contributions to the community had been offered;
  - That the feed-in tariffs for renewable energy developments were coming to an end, but that he hoped that the Government would reconsider.
  - He asked the Committee to support the application.

- (ch) In the context of the abovementioned observations, the senior Solicitor emphasised that financial contributions should not be considered, as these would be dealt with outside the planning system, this was also true for the feed-in tariff. The Committee needed to assess the application and consider the matters to hand.

Proposed and seconded to undertake a site visit.

**RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.**

**10. Application No C15/0783/42/MG – Site of Caersalem Chapel, Lôn Terfyn, Morfa Nefyn**

Reserved matters for the erection of four dwellings.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that the site had received outline planning permission under application C06D/0703/42/AM, for a residential development of four houses, one of which would be affordable, however; the affordable plot had not yet been determined.

It was noted that size, appearance and landscaping were the matters to consider as part of this application.

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

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. In accordance with the plans
2. 2.4m x 45m visibility splays

Highways notes – in relation to powers under Section 171/184 of the Highways Act 1980 to carry out work near the highway and to take care to prevent surface water from the curtilage discharging onto the highway.

Compliance with the conditions imposed on outline application C06D/0703/42/AM.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 3.55 pm

---

**CHAIRMAN**