
PLANNING COMMITTEE 13/3/17

Present: Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones - Chair
Councillor Elwyn Edwards - Vice-chair

Councillors: Endaf Cooke, Simon Glyn, Gwen Griffith, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen, W. Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams and John Wyn Williams.

Others invited: Councillors Lesley Day, E. Selwyn Griffiths, Jason Humphreys, Sion Wyn Jones, Mair Rowlands, Elfed Williams and R. H. Wyn Williams (Local Members).

Also in attendance: Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Planning Manager), A. Rhys Roberts (Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Officer - Transportation), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Bethan Adams (Member Support Officer).

Apologies: Councillors Dyfrig Wynn Jones and Eric M. Jones

1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

- (a) Councillor John Wyn Williams declared a personal interest, in item 5.6 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1556/18/LL) as his cousin and niece lived nearby.

The Member was of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest and he withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the application.

- (b) The Senior Solicitor declared a personal interest in item 5.3 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1430/44/LL) because he knew the applicant and his family.

The officer was of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest and he left the Chamber during the discussion on the application.

- (c) The following members declared an interest that they were a local member in relation to the items noted:

- Councillor Elfed Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C16/0367/18/LL);
- Councillor Sion Wyn Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.2 and 5.5 on the agenda, (planning application numbers C16/1406/18/LL and C16/1524/18/LL);
- Councillor Selwyn Griffiths (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.3 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1430/44/LL);
- Councillor Jason Humphreys (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/1472/44/LL);
- Councillor R. Hefin Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.6 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1556/18/LL);
- Councillor R. H. Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.7 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1571/39/LL);
- Councillor Lesley Day, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.8 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1614/99/LL);
- Councillor June Marshall, (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.9 on the agenda (planning application number C16/1675/11/LL);

- Councillor Mair Rowlands (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.9 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/1675/11/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.

2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 13 February 2017, as a true record.

3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

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

RESOLVED

1. Application number C16/0367/18/LL – Land near Capel Maes y Dref, Clwt y Bont, Deiniolen,

Full application to construct 12 houses and create an entrance and estate road.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site had been earmarked in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan (GUDP) for residential development (houses for general need and the open market) and that a Development Brief had been provided for the site to accompany the designation. It was noted that the proposal would involve the erection of four three-bedroom houses (affordable houses), four two-bedroom houses (open market) along with four three-bedroom houses (open market).

It was noted that the proposal of providing an element of affordable housing and a mix of different houses on this site would correspond to the policy aims of the GUDP and the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (JLDP). It was explained that although the JLDP had not been adopted, it was now a material planning consideration under development control. It was elaborated that national policy stated that it was important to have a combination of market value housing and local need affordable housing along with the need to provide as many affordable houses as possible across the area.

In terms of the transport and access, biodiversity and flooding matters, the conditions recommended made the application acceptable.

It was reported that the applicant had submitted a viability assessment that stated that the development would not be viable should an educational contribution and an open space of recreational value contribution be provided in response to the policy requirements. Reference was made to the Joint Planning Policy Unit's assessment of the information submitted. Based on an assessment of the Joint Planning Policy Unit, it was clear that the development would not be viable if the contributions would be needed. It was noted that national policy noted, provided that the infrastructure required for realising the development was protected, that the provision of affordable housing should be prioritised.

- (b) A request was made to share photographs - it was noted that they could not be shared at the meeting but that they could be submitted to the Planning Service.

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

- That flood problems existed in the area;
- That the Council and Natural Resources Wales (NRW) were looking for a solution to the problems and approving this application would prevent this from progressing;
- That the proposal would exacerbate the situation in terms of flooding problems.

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

- That there were concerns in terms of flooding on nearby land and that the Council and NRW had assessed the situation;
- That the ditch needed to be retained so that the proposal would be acceptable to the Biodiversity Unit;
- No discussion had taken place with the owner in terms of using the land in question as part of the solution to the flooding problems;
- The application site had been designated as a housing site;
- That discussions had been held in terms of the design and land drainage, the matters had been addressed.

(ch) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and he made the following main points:-

- Questioned the need for housing considering that five sites in the area had received permission for a total of 49 houses, none had been commenced although Tai Teg noted that there was a housing demand;
- The fact that the site had been removed from the LDP as a housing site should be considered;
- That there were flooding problems in the area and that the proposal would not improve the situation;
- Concern that the condition of the road would exacerbate due to increased use and water on the road;
- An open space of recreational value should be included in the development in accordance with the development brief considering that there is no pavement leading from the site to make it safe to go to another area.

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

- The report addressed the land drainage and flooding matters, NRW and Welsh Water were satisfied with the proposal provided that a condition in terms of submitting a drainage plan for the site was imposed. She noted that the Committee, should it wish, could ask the applicant to submit drainage plans prior to making a decision on the application;
- The Transportation Unit had no objection;
- An open space could not be included in the development due to viability matters.

(dd) A proposal to undertake a site visit was made and seconded.

An amendment was proposed and seconded noting that the applicant should also be requested to submit a drainage plan.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- That it was a statutory requirement for children to have a safe place to play and therefore the provision of an open space on the site or a contribution towards new or improved facilities in another location should be reconsidered;
- Concern that it is an over-development;
- No evidence of the need and too many houses for sale in the village;
- A technical report should be received in relation to drainage;
- The Local Member should participate in the discussions and have an opportunity to submit evidence.

RESOLVED to defer the application in order to undertake a site visit and ask the applicant to submit a drainage plan.

2. Application number C16/1406/18/LL - Land behind Bethel Chapel, Bethel, Caernarfon.

Erect four affordable houses, create a new estate road and a new vehicular access.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the proposal involved creating an extension to the estate road with a turning space and siting of four semi-detached two-storey houses. It was noted that policy CH7 of the GUDP approved proposals for affordable homes on suitable rural exception sites directly adjoining the boundaries of villages or centres. Attention was drawn to the fact that the southern side of the site abutted the development boundary near the Bron Gwynedd estate and, that from this perspective, the site could be a rural exception site. It was noted further that the policy only approved developments for affordable housing where the need had been proven. It was reported that observations had been received from the Council's Housing Strategic Unit acknowledging the need for this type of affordable housing in the area, along with a letter from Grŵp Cynefin expressing their intention to purchase the house. It was noted that it was considered that the proposal satisfied the requirements of policy CH7 and the Supplementary Planning Guidance for affordable housing.

It was reported that a large number of the objections received referred to previous refusals for residential development on the site and on appeal. It was explained that the application that had been refused on appeal (3/18/384E) was an application for outline permission to develop the whole field for a residential development and that the policy considerations had been different. It was noted that it was considered that this development was acceptable in principle based on the GUDP's policies and also within the LDP therefore there was no justification to object to the proposal on policy grounds.

It was highlighted that the Planning Inspector was of the opinion that it was not possible to gain acceptable access to the site and that the additional traffic off Bron Gwynedd was not acceptable in terms of a development that would provide approximately 12 to 25 houses. It was noted that the Transportation Unit was of the opinion that the increase emanating from the additional four houses would not be substantial and could be acceptable without causing harm to road safety.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:
- That the report provided clear guidance to the Committee;
 - That the application had been amended in response to concerns in terms of amenities, the access had been redesigned, a turning space had been provided and the parking provision had been amended in response to the observations of the Transportation Unit;
 - In terms of land drainage, a solution had been agreed with Welsh Water in principle.
 - The development would contribute towards the Council's target in terms of providing affordable housing;
 - That Grŵp Cynefin had expressed their intention to purchase the houses.
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and he made the following main points:-
- That the site was outside the development boundary and the land had not been included in the LDP due to the observations of the Planning Service;

- Local concerns in terms of access to the site, sewerage and land drainage, the need to consider the additional pressure;
- That Welsh Water had objected originally and no evidence had been received to confirm Welsh Water's solution;
- That there was a need for affordable housing, but in the right location;
- That the Community Council objected to the proposal;
- To ask the Planning Committee to visit the site.

(ch) A proposal to undertake a site visit was made and seconded.

A member noted that it would be appropriate for the Committee to receive confirmation of Welsh Water's views.

RESOLVED to undertake a site visit and receive confirmation of Welsh Water's views.

3. Application number C16/1430/44/LL - Land of the former Moelwyn Dairy, Penamser Road, Porthmadog

Erection of a two-storey four bedroom residential dwelling in open countryside with the installation of a septic tank and creation of a new vehicular access and access road.

(a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the application site was located outside the defined development boundary for the Porthmadog area and consequently it was considered as a site in the countryside.

It was noted that paragraph 4.3.1 of Technical Advice Note (TAN) 6 'Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities' noted that one of the few circumstances in which a new isolated residential development in the open countryside could be justified was when accommodation was required to enable agricultural or rural enterprise workers to live at, or close to, their workplace. It was noted further that the essential nature of this requirement would depend on the needs of the rural enterprise in question in each specific case, and that it would not depend on the personal choice or circumstances of any of the associated individuals.

It was highlighted that there was a reference in the application, specifically within the Design and Access Statement, together with letters of support, to the current agricultural use of the land along with a proposed business plan to change the use of this land for a new sustainable business as well as a local mountain rescue service using a part of the land. It was noted that no information had been submitted to the Planning Service to confirm the exact type of business proposed.

Nevertheless, it was noted that it appeared that there was an established agricultural use on the land, and therefore, in accordance with the requirements of TAN 6, should the application be for a house for a full-time agricultural or rural enterprise worker, information had to be submitted that related to functional, time, finance and other dwelling tests to prove the need and justification for the construction of a dwelling in open countryside. It was also noted that the house could not be considered as an affordable house for the reasons highlighted in the report.

It was noted that letters of support to the proposal had been received from local individuals and others, full attention had been given to all material planning matters noted in the observations received.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the applicant had submitted a formal pre-application enquiry for the proposal as shown under reference Y16/000248. It was confirmed in a formal response at the time that such a proposal would be contrary to the requirements of

relevant policies and that the Authority, as a result, would not be able to support the proposal.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:
- The necessity for the house to be on this site to manage the established 90 acre farm;
 - That paragraph 4.5.1 of TAN 6 noted that it could be appropriate and that it was essential for the house to be located on the site in order to manage the farm in its current form along with another rural enterprise;
 - That the proposal was acceptable in relation to paragraphs 4.5.3 and 4.6 of TAN 6;
 - That a ruin was located on the application site;
 - That there was no flood risk on the site;
 - That the proposal would provide a home for a family and secure the continuation of a family business and satisfy current needs and the needs of future generations;
 - That Porthmadog Town Council and local residents were supportive.
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:
- That he was in favour of the developments considering the lack of houses in the area as the majority of Porthmadog was within the flood zone;
 - Questioned whether the site was in the countryside as the rescue team building, industrial works and a caravan site was located nearby;
 - That the design was acceptable and the size made sense for a family of five;
 - That the proposal would provide a permanent home for a local family;
 - That the rural enterprise would create jobs for local people and would lead to an investment in the area;
 - That it was essential to secure the continuation of the farm and the creation of a new rural enterprise;
 - That the applicant was willing to accept a 106 Agreement on the house;
 - That the Planning Service should seek information from the applicant in relation to the rural enterprise if the information was insufficient;
 - That the applicant had contacted Tai Teg on three occasions but that no response had been received;
 - That there were three options for the Committee to consider - either approve the application, undertake a site visit or defer in order to ensure that every source had been followed in relation to TAN 6.
- (ch) In response to the above observations, the Planning Manager noted:
- In accordance with the requirements of TAN 6, the need and justification for erecting a house in open countryside had to be proven;
 - Should the need for a new rural enterprise dwelling be proven in accordance with TAN 6, that it would be possible for the applicant to receive permission to locate a chalet on an appropriate site for three years in the first place in order to have an opportunity to ensure that the enterprise was viable;
 - The application submitted from the applicant noted that it was for an agricultural house / new rural enterprise therefore no more information had been requested. If the application submitted would have referred specifically to this element then the Planning Service would have requested further information.
 - That Tai Teg had noted that the applicant had not contacted them;
 - That the size of the house was a material consideration with the internal floor area measuring 225m².
- (d) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application in order to receive more information from the applicant in order to establish whether the proposal was an agricultural house or a house for a new rural enterprise.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- That the size of the house was too large;
- In fairness, the need to receive information about the new rural enterprise in order to assess the viability of the development;
- The applicant was responsible for submitting information to support the application and the need to follow the agricultural points system; otherwise it would be a new house in the countryside.

RESOLVED to defer the application in order to receive more information from the applicant in order to establish whether the proposal was an agricultural house or a house for a new rural enterprise.

4. Application number C16/1472/44/LL – 1 Llys y Porth, Porthmadog

Full application for the change of use of an existing residential dwelling into a house in multiple occupation.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site was located within the development boundary of the town of Porthmadog. It was explained that the proposal, according to the submitted plans, did not change the existing internal layout of the building or intended to make any external changes to the building.

It was noted that policy CH14 of the GUDP approved proposals to change the use of the houses in this respect unless the development would not create an over-provision of this type of accommodation in a specific street or area where the cumulative impact has a negative impact on the social and environmental character of the street or area, or is likely to do so. It is not believed that another building in the close vicinity is being used as a house in multiple occupation and therefore, it is not believed that it would lead to an unacceptable cumulative impact within this specific area. The proposal was acceptable in principle.

It was noted that objections had been received to the application as a result of the public consultation with concern highlighted in terms of the harmful impact of the proposed use (where it was alleged that it had already commenced) on the nearby residential amenities in comparison with the current legal use of the site. Given the current legal use of the property as a five-bedroom residential property and the amenity impacts that could arise from that use, it is not considered that there would be a significant change to the amenities of the neighbourhood from approving the development in question.

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 the use of the house as a house in multiple occupation had commenced for a year;
 - That anti-social behaviour in front of the house caused concern to her and her family;
 - That parking space was narrow near the site with more cars parking in front of the house leading to arguments;
 - That the house was not open to local people as accommodation, as it should be;
 - That the proposal led to the loss of a family home.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representative noted the following main points:
- That she was unaware that there was anti-social behaviour in front of the house and that she could not envisage the professionals who lived in the house behaving like this;

- In terms of parking, no resident owned a car and they did not intend to own a car either;
- That it was accommodation for dementia specialist nurses who worked in the Pines Residential Home in Cricieth;
- That the proposal enabled the Residential Home to provide care for local people.

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

- That he was aware and appreciated the need for accommodation for nurses;
- That the houses in multiple occupation licensing system could not deal with all matters deriving from the development;
- That there were parking problems in the area and that the proposal would exacerbate the situation;
- That there was a lack of houses in the Porthmadog area;
- Considering the observations of the objector, the site was not suitable for such a development.

(d) In response to the observations regarding the lack of parking spaces, the Planning Manager noted that there were no parking spaces associated with the current use; therefore, it was not considered that the proposal would change the situation.

Members made observations and asked questions, the officers responded as follows:

- In terms of refusing the application due to a lack of parking spaces, the Transportation Unit did not object to the proposal;
- If the application was refused, the reason in terms of a negative impact on resident's amenities based on Policy CH14 of the GUDP could be a valid planning reason;
- Following a recent change in legislation, it was now a requirement to make a planning application for houses in multiple occupation of this scale;
- That it was an application for a house in multiple occupation and that the applicant's justification in terms of the need/use was providing accommodation for specialist dementia nurses who worked at the Pines Residential Home and that this in itself was not a material planning consideration;
- That there was a need to be careful in terms of observations that generalised the residents of houses in multiple occupation. That it was possible that there were anti-social elements on the site as had been noted by the objector, but there was no evidence to justify generalising;
- That it would be difficult to place a condition on a planning permission to bind the use to specialist dementia nurses only as it would be likely that this would be unreasonable in relation to the statutory tests;
- If the use as a house in multiple occupation would be approved, the licensing system would control the use.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Time
2. Compliance with plans

5. Application number C16/1524/18/LL - Warehouse near Maes yr Haf, Bethel

To demolish the existing warehouse and erect a two-storey house.

(a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application site was located in a residential area that was relatively consistent in terms of the nature of the dwellings' design, as they were generally two-storey detached or

semi-detached houses (with a few bungalows) in relatively substantial gardens. It was noted in comparison with the remainder of the area that the proposed houses was of a completely alien design to the location, with a metal, mono-pitch roof, that would not be in keeping at all with any other houses in the locality. In addition, the development would be out of character with the density of the local development pattern with only one small strip of land measuring 10m² for the amenities of residents in the back and a parking space in the front.

It was emphasised that the parking provision associated with the development did not meet the Wales Parking Guidance (2008).

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- That the proposal coincided with the local area and kept to the current building;
 - That a bespoke parking area would be provided for every house;
 - There would be less traffic in comparison with the previous use as a warehouse;
 - That neighbours were supportive of the proposal and of the opinion that it would improve the site;
 - That the site was within the development boundary of the village.
- (c) The application was supported by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) and he made the following main points:
- That the building was in a poor condition and the proposal would be an improvement;
 - In terms of the lack of parking spaces, there was a parking space on the highway opposite the site with space for six cars;
 - That the site was within the development boundary of the village;
 - That letters of support from local neighbours noted that there were no traffic problems or a lack of parking space.
- (ch) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:
- That developing the site was acceptable in principle but that possibly there was only space for one house on the site;
 - That the current design did not justify a similar design;
 - That the design could be amended to satisfy the road safety element, likely that the footprint would need to be changed;
 - That the parking spaces had to be specific to the site and not on the street.
- (d) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

The seconder noted that for consistency with a decision on a previous application where the design was similar to a shed, the application should be approved. The Senior Solicitor explained that a proposal should not be seconded in order to open a discussion; a proposal should only be seconded when a member shared that view. A member noted that it was difficult to propose or second before a discussion had commenced if a member was uncertain. In response, the Senior Solicitor noted in accordance with procedural rules that a proposal had to be made and seconded before a discussion was held, and if a member was uncertain then he/she should not make or second a proposal.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- That the design attempted to reflect what was on the site currently but that the design should be improved;
- Supported the proposal but there was room to improve the design;
- That the design needed to reflect the surrounding houses - a metal roof would not be in keeping;
- The applicant should reconsider the parking provision.

A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse and it carried on the Chair's casting vote.

RESOLVED to refuse the application.

Reasons:

1. The development, due to its design, materials and density would not be in keeping with its urban context and would be harmful to the visual amenities of the residential area. The application is therefore contrary to policies B22, B23 and B25 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan along with the advice included in the Gwynedd Design Guidelines which state that every development should respect the spatial quality of its surroundings.
2. The parking provision proposed does not satisfy the Wales Parking Standards 2008 and the arrangement as shown would create a hazard for the users of the nearby highway. The application is therefore contrary to Policies CH33 and CH36 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan.

6. Application number C16/1556/18/LL – Tŷ Gwyn, Waun, Penisarwaun

Convert existing buildings into three self-serviced holiday units

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the application was in accordance with policies C4 and D15 of the GUDP and was therefore acceptable in principle. It was acknowledged that it was inevitable that some noise and disturbance would emanate from the site, but, given that the site was on the outskirts of a cluster of 21 existing houses, it was not considered that the disturbance emanating from three holiday units would cause additional significant harm to residents' amenities.

It was noted that the Community Council did not object to the proposal but that it highlighted its concern that the road leading to the site was narrow and that additional traffic could cause problems. Attention was also drawn to the fact that the Transportation Unit accepted, although the development would be likely to lead to an increase in traffic levels along the local road network, that increase would not be an unreasonable increase or be harmful to the safety of the road network.

It was noted that considerable correspondence showed evidence of historic flood incidents in the area including allegations that the local sewerage system was insufficient to cope with any increased use. Welsh Water had confirmed that there was capacity in the public sewer system to take sewage from three additional units provided that no surface water or land drainage water flowed into the system. Attention was drawn to the fact that NRW or Gwynedd Consultancy's Land Drainage Department did not have an objection to the development. It was confirmed that the buildings would not be extended and the surface of the parking area would be of slate chippings therefore there would not be an increase in hard surfaces on the ground, and consequently, the development would not be likely to exacerbate water drainage problems in any way.

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

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:
- Concerns in terms of road safety;

- The proposal would affect the human rights of the residents that were protected by Articles 2 and 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR);
 - That an application had been refused approximately 30 years ago because the road was too narrow;
 - That she objected to the balcony because it would lead to overlooking.
- (c) Taking advantage of the opportunity to speak, the applicant noted the following points:
- The intention of the application was to use the buildings for a sustainable business to enable his children to return to the area;
 - That they wished to take advantage of the green holiday market and provide a plot of land for wildlife on the site;
 - That the Transportation Unit was of the opinion that there would not be a substantial increase in traffic;
 - That the proposal provided eight parking spaces on the site and that he was prepared to create a new passing place;
 - That the application would ensure economic use of the farm buildings.
- (ch) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:
- Concern regarding road safety along the narrow road, an additional eight cars would overload the road;
 - That there were sewerage problems in the area, the proposal would overload the system;
 - Despite the applicant's numerous vows, should there be a change in the site's ownership, there would be a risk in terms of the future generations;
 - To ask the Planning Committee to visit the site.
- (d) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Manager noted:
- That there was a robust recommendation before the committee and that the statutory bodies had not objected;
 - That the applicant volunteered further provisions in terms of passing places on the road and a parcel of land for wildlife on the site;
 - That the site could be visited to see the passing places on the road.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. In accordance with the plans.
3. Materials for the balcony to be agreed.
4. Holiday use only/keep a register
5. Withdrawal of permitted development rights
6. Biodiversity condition
7. Need to agree on a surface water and land water drainage plan
8. Creation of parking spaces prior to the occupancy of the holiday units
9. Agree on the location and create a passing place for cars on the applicant's land prior to the commencement of the development and for it to be retained.
10. Create a wildlife area

7. Application number C16/1571/39/LL – Former Natwest Bank, Abersoch

Change of use of Bank (A2) to Shop (A1) and ice-cream parlour and café (A3) on ground floor with seating area and servery to the rear and a self-contained flat (C3) on the first floor together with an extension and alterations to building.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the property was in a prominent location near Abersoch High Street. It was noted that the proposal was a way to ensure that suitable use was made of a redundant building in a prominent location in the village.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the applicant had stated his willingness to accept a condition on any permission restricting the opening and closing hours of the property to specific hours along with a condition to prevent extending the use of the ice-cream parlour to a full restaurant or any wider activities within use class A3. It was noted that it would be difficult to justify a condition on the permission to restrict the property's opening and closing hours in such a situation as the site occupied a location in the centre of the village where various local businesses such as shops, restaurants, a garage and public house were located.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), supported the application and highlighted the concerns of nearby houses and he asked whether or not it would be possible to impose a condition that the business closed at approximately 10:00pm - 11:00pm.

In response, the Planning Manager noted that she was uncomfortable imposing a condition regarding closing times considering that no other properties of similar use in the area were being controlled. She added that a condition could be imposed that prevented it from being used as a takeaway or any other broader use within use class A3.

A member noted that such a condition should be imposed in order to reduce the disturbance to local residents.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Five years to commence the work.
2. Slates on the roof of the rear building.
3. Stone finish of the rear extension to be in-keeping with the main building.
4. Install the air extraction system within the existing chimney in accordance with the plans dated 13 January 2017 prior to commencing the permitted use.
5. In accordance with plans.
6. Prevent takeaway use or broader use within A3.

8. Application number C16/1614/99/LL – Bryn Llifon, Ffordd Meirion, Bangor

Change of use of building from nursing home to student accommodation with 31 bedrooms and management facilities.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site was in a mixed use area of Upper Bangor, approximately 250m from the main building of Bangor University with the BBC's Bryn Meirion Studio nearby and the University's halls of residence located opposite.

Reference was made to Bangor City Council's objection to the proposal as it would be an over-development of the site, that there were similar facilities already located in the vicinity and it would lead to an increase in traffic, noise and disruption to residents.

It was explained that there was no specific policy in the GUDP dealing with a development of this type; however, policy C4 supported plans to convert buildings for re-use for suitable purposes.

It was noted that the building had been used, until February 2016, as a residential home for the elderly for 31 residents and considering that such a use led to considerable traffic movements by staff, families and medical support, including night-time activity, it was not considered that student use would not be significantly different in terms of car movements or hours of disruption.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations received, noting that the Joint Planning Policy Unit had assessed the Linguistic Statement and noted on the whole that it was considered that the nature of Bangor, in terms of population size, the linguistic pattern of the town, the variety of services and facilities available there meant that the developments should not have a substantial detrimental impact on the Welsh language.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-
- That the family business had a number of student accommodations in Bangor and that they had carefully considered whether this was the best use to be made of the building;
 - That a low percentage of the demand was being satisfied from such accommodation in Bangor;
 - That it was intended to draw up a management plan for the site;
 - That the proposal would reduce the pressure in terms of converting houses into houses in multiple occupation;
 - That the proposal would safeguard the building and there would be less coming and going considering the site's previous use;
 - That a lease was in existence regarding parking spaces for BBC staff on the site and that there was no intention to change this arrangement.
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and she noted the following main points:-
- That the site was located in a residential area and that the development would have a negative impact on the area;
 - That there was an over-provision of student accommodation in the Garth ward;
 - Concern regarding waste and recycling and that problems already existed in the area and that she had submitted a Notice of Motion to the Full Council meeting on 3 March 2017 in relation to the matter;
 - That there was a substantial percentage of Welsh first language families in the area and that the proposal would have a negative impact on the language;
 - There was a lack of parking spaces;
 - Asked the applicant to reconsider the proposal in order to provide self-contained units for local people;
 - That the amenities of the local neighbourhood would not be protected;
 - Concern regarding the impact of anti-social behaviour.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted by members:

- That it was better for the building that was already used as accommodation provision to be used for the same purposes, provided that the application was approved with suitable conditions;
- That the proposal would reduce the pressure in terms of converting houses into houses in multiple occupation;

- Concern that Welsh-speaking families would move from the area due to the increase in the numbers of students as there was a substantial percentage in the ward already;
- The need to receive additional technical reports. Did the language impact assessment show a significant change?
- Objection towards houses in multiple occupation in streets; however, this application was not in that situation;
- Whilst sympathising with the Local Member's observations, there was a need to be pragmatic as there would be some kind of accommodation provision on the site and it would not re-open as a residential home.

In response to the above-mentioned observations, the Planning Manager noted that there were students in the area already, the need to provide a range of various accommodation and that the Joint Planning Policy Unit had noted that there would be no significant change in terms of the language.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Time
2. In accordance with the plans
3. The site management plan to be submitted and agreed before hand with the Local Planning Authority
4. Parking facilities in accordance with the plans
5. The footpath to College Road must be completed before commencement of use.

Notes:

1. Highways
2. Welsh Water

9. Application number C16/1675/11/LL – Coed Menai, Menai Avenue, Bangor

Change of use of existing house (C3 use class) to bed and breakfast/hotel accommodation (C1 use class)

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that policy D14 of the GUDP approved proposals to convert existing dwellings into high quality serviced holiday accommodation provided, in the case of a development within development boundaries, that the development is suitable considering the site, the location and settlement in question.

It was noted that the site was within the development boundary of the city of Bangor and although Menai Avenue was mainly residential, the site stands near to the Ffriddoedd site, with many University facilities such as halls of residence and leisure and social facilities and therefore there was a considerable amount of activity in the area. Considering the nature of the site and the surrounding area, it was deemed that the principle of the development met the requirements of the policy.

It was acknowledged that although there could be some increase in the number of people using the building, considering the nature of hotel use with the main activity during short periods of the day only, the likelihood of disturbance to nearby residents could reduce from this type of use.

It was noted that the development was suitable and acceptable for the site and that it complied with the local and national policies and guidelines noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:
- The proposal would have a negative impact on her home and impact her amenities in relation to noise;
 - Concern regarding the parking provision;
 - That the site was in a residential area and within the Conservation Area and that the proposal would harm this character and that it should be refused for this reason.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:
- That it was her and her partner's ambition to establish a quality hospitality business;
 - That there was a lack of such provision in the area;
 - That the property would be serviced and although they did not live on the site, the guests would have 24 hour telephone contact with them;
 - That the proposal would contribute towards the local economy.
- (ch) Councillor June Marshall, local member (a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and she made the following main points:
- That it would have a negative impact on the Conservation Area and green space would be lost in order to create a parking area;
 - That the commercial use was contrary to the residential use of the area;
 - That the proposal led to the loss of permanent housing stock.

Councillor Mair Rowlands, local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:

- That there was local concern in relation to the scale and nature of the development and the impact on the area's amenities;
- That the proposal led to the loss of permanent housing stock thus creating a precedent that could lead to a collection of similar developments in the area;
- It would cause harm to the Conservation Area.

RESOLVED to approve the application.

Conditions:

1. Five years
2. Work to be in accordance with the plans
3. Materials for the exterior building to be agreed
4. A porous surface is required for the parking area to ensure that there is no change in surface water flow.
5. All the parking will be provided prior to commencement of the business use.

The meeting commenced at 1:00pm and concluded at 4:30pm.

CHAIR