

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 7/09/15

---

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

**Councillors:** Gwen Griffith, Dyfrig Wynn Jones, June Marshall, W. Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, John Wyn Williams (substitute), Owain Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Others invited:** Councillors Aled Lloyd Evans, Siân Gwennllïan, Elin Walker Jones, Jason Humphreys and Elfed Williams (Local Members).

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Engineer), Medi Emlyn Davies (Development Control Officer), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Lowri Haf Evans (Members' Support and Scrutiny Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillors Endaf Cooke, Elwyn Edwards, Dilwyn Lloyd (substitute), Hefin Williams, Gruffydd Williams and Councillors Ann Williams and Llywarch B Jones (Local Members).

### 1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

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

- Councillor June Marshall in item 5 on the agenda, (planning application C13/0412/13/AM) as she knew the applicant.
- Councillor Gwen Griffith, in item 5 on the agenda (planning application C13/0412/13/AM) as her son lived close by and walked the public footpath through the site to the nearby primary school.
- Councillor Owain Williams in item 5 on the agenda (planning application C15/0034/37/LL) as he was the owner of a caravan park that was located less than six miles from the site.
- Councillor Anne Lloyd-Jones in item 5 on the agenda, (planning application C15/0337/11/AM), as she was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.
- Councillor Michael Sol Owen, in item 5 on the agenda, (planning application C15/0337/11/AM), as he was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.
- Councillor John Wyn Williams, in item 5 on the agenda, (planning application C15/0337/11/AM), as he was a member of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.

The following officer declared a personal interest for the reasons noted:

- Medi Emlyn Davies (Development Control Officer) in item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0984/44/HD) as she was a shareholder.

The Members and the officer were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and they withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the applications noted.

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

- Councillor Elin Walker Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation

- to item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C13/0412/13/AM).
- Councillor Elfed Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application number C13/0611/18/AM);
- Councillor P Jason Humphreys (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C14/0984/44/HD);
- Councillor Aled Evans (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C15/0421/41/LL);
- Councillor Siân Gwenllïan (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C15/0435/20/LL – C15/0603/20/CR).

## 2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee that took place on 27 July 2015, 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.

### 1. Application No. C13/0412/13/AM

#### Land at Maes Coetmor, Bethesda

An outline application to erect 69 dwellings, including 20 affordable units

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the application's background and noted that this was an outline application for planning permission (with all details reserved) to erect 69 new residential units on agricultural land in the village of Bethesda. The application was submitted to the Planning Committee in June 2015, where it was deferred in order to receive further information regarding bats, trees and the loss of important habitat. It was noted that a Tree Preservation Order had been attached to a tree on the site since 31.8.15 and that the application's agent had now submitted assessments on trees and bats and these had been assessed.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was noted that the site was designated in the UDP for housing and the proposal would respond to the demand for housing in the area. A reference was made to an appeal resolution on a nearby site where a residential development had been refused on the Gray Garage site by the Council in 2014. An appeal was conducted as a result of this refusal and the Inspector stated in his appeal decision that the development was required in order to satisfy the need for housing as current targets were not being met.

Reference was also made to the objections to the application with the majority concerning the Welsh Language and the claim that this development if approved would have a detrimental impact on the language in Bethesda / Dyffryn Ogwen. In response, one of the conclusions of the Housing and Language Study, which was conducted jointly with the Isle of Anglesey County Council and the Snowdonia National Park Authority, was that promoting the right mix of housing units in the right locations could contribute towards sustaining or strengthening Welsh-speaking communities. The information reiterated information about the relative strength of the language in the Ogwen ward and it referred to the existing social infrastructure, the support from the Language Initiative, the schools' language policy and additional measures that could be put in place.

Together this could contribute to the aim of maintaining and strengthening the language in Bethesda and the local area.

Although the Joint Planning Policy Unit had referred to some deficiencies on the Language Statement submitted by the applicant, it was considered that in essence it was acceptable and therefore the application was acceptable and satisfied the requirements of Strategic Policy 1 and the requirements of policies A1, A2 and A3 in terms of linguistic matters.

In the context of traffic and flooding, there were no objections to the proposal.

It was stressed that there was an amendment to the recommendation in the report as the assessments for trees and bats had been received after the report had been prepared. Having assessed the assessments the proposal was considered to be unacceptable on the grounds that a lack of acceptable information had been submitted in relation to the ability to thoroughly assess the impact on protected species, namely the activities of bats as well as an assessment of the trees as roosts. In the same manner, no sufficient assessment had been submitted for the trees in terms of the impact of the proposed development on these including those that were now protected by the Tree Preservation Order.

- (b) Attention was drawn to the additional observations form.
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:
  - That the three Community Committees had stated that the development was totally unsuitable
  - Consideration needed to be given to flooding, traffic, the welfare of the Welsh Language and the local need for housing
  - Flooding – insufficient information
  - Traffic – inconsistencies on the information submitted – obvious matters had been ignored
  - The welfare of the Welsh Language – conclusions were totally unfounded. The understanding of the Joint Planning Policy Unit was insulting
  - Need for housing – no evidence of the numbers. Insufficient information received
  - Request for the Planning Committee to refuse the application on the basis of the above four considerations together with biodiversity matters.
- (ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the agent on behalf of the applicant noted the following main points:
  - Flooding and traffic were matters that had already been addressed
  - The location of the site had been identified as part of the Local Unitary Development Plan and therefore it was not an application that imposed on green land.
  - The development was a response to the need for local housing
  - From the beginning it was proposed to retain the trees and therefore there was a willingness to re-discuss the site's layout
  - Bats – An Independent Inspector had stated that the development would be of benefit to bats.
  - A request for the Committee to give full consideration to the application in question
- (d) Taking advantage of the right to speak Councillor Elin Walker Jones, acting as a Local Member (she was not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:
  - That the application was contrary to the policies

- Public opinion was to object – this had been undertaken via letters, petitions, community councils and language enterprises.
- Lack of planning to safeguard green land / bats / trees. Welcomed the order but this was insufficient. The applicant had not provided a sufficient report.
- Flooding – assessment completed in 2010 and was therefore dated. Historical problems existed on this site
- Traffic – the proposal would entail an increase of 77% in traffic on Ffordd Coetmor. Data had been collected during school holidays and was therefore incorrect. Again, it was noted that the traffic assessment had been completed in 2009! There were narrow roads here and creating passing places was insufficient to alleviate the impact - totally insufficient.
- 70 houses were already for sale on the open market in Bethesda - therefore why were more needed?
- A very superficial assessment had been submitted by the applicant in terms of the impact on the Welsh Language. The development was too big and therefore added 50% to the existing Coetmor population – again mitigation measures by the applicant were totally insufficient.
- A request for refusal based on the above consideration – to finally refuse, once and for all.

(dd) In response to the above observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted:-

- That the planning considerations had been considered in detail. The recommendation was to refuse based on biodiversity and trees. The principle of building houses was acceptable and this was a response to the evidence that housing was needed in the area.
- No objections had been received from the statutory consultees dealing with highway and flooding issues.
- There was no evidence to refuse the application on the grounds of Language, Highways, Flooding and Need. If the application was refused on the basis of these four reasons then the application would have to be referred to a cooling-off period.

Proposed and seconded to refuse the application based on the officers' recommendation only.

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

- The way that the language assessment had been received from the Joint Planning Policy Unit was not a fair reflection. This element should be considered further in terms of weighing up the information in detail.
- Bethesda was now a village under threat on the outskirts of an Anglicised city.
- Building 69 houses on the site was not acceptable.
- Follow the advice received
- The Welsh Government had to consider linguistic matters rather than transfer the decision to an inspector who had not made any comment about the language.

#### **To refuse – reasons**

**The proposal is considered to be unacceptable based on the lack of sufficient information submitted in relation to the ability to thoroughly assess the impact on protected species namely bat activity together with an assessment of the trees as roosting areas. In the same manner no sufficient and acceptable assessment was submitted of the trees in terms of the impact of the proposed development on these trees with some with a Tree Preservation Order. Consequently, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Strategic Policy 1, policies A1, A3, B19, B20 and B23 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, the advice given in paragraphs 4.4.1 and 4.4.2 of Technical Advice Note 5: Planning**

and Nature Conservation and paragraph 5.5.3 of Planning Policy Wales as it is considered that insufficient or acceptable information has been provided in order to be able to fully assess the impact of the development.

## 2. Application No. C13/0611/18/AM Rhiwgoch, Clwt-y-bont, Caernarfon

A residential development of 17 houses (including two affordable units), along with a new access.

- (a) The Senior Planning and Environment Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that the cooling-off application had been reported to the Planning Committee on 27.07.15 with the officers' recommendation to approve the proposal as the applicant had submitted information responding to the concerns of the Planning Committee based on **overdevelopment and a lack of play area provision** following the application's submission to Committee back in March 2015. However, the Committee decided to defer the decision on the application in order to confirm that the Linguistic and Community Statement had been received and assessed appropriately by the Joint Planning Policy Unit. The Joint Planning Policy Unit confirmed that the Statement had been received and assessed appropriately by the Unit and this had been included as part of the report submitted originally to the Planning Committee on 02.03.15.

It was noted that this was an outline application to build 17 two-storey houses including two affordable houses on a site south-west of Deiniolen/Clwt-y-bont on a plot of brownfield land included within the village development boundary. The proposal also included the creation of a vehicular opening to the adjacent class III county highway. It was explained that a previous application for 17 houses (including two affordable houses) was approved in July, 2010 with a Section 106 agreement to bind two of the 17 houses as affordable homes. However, no reserved details application was submitted within the statutory period and the permission had now lapsed.

In response to the concerns highlighted by the Committee regarding over-development and the provision of a play area, full additional information had been submitted in the report. In short, regarding over-development – there was no increase in the number of houses proposed in this latest application compared with the application approved previously in 2010 and it was acceptable in terms of the density recommendation per hectare. Regarding the provision of a play area, it was noted that a play area had now been included in the plan – it was noted that every house had a private garden and additional play areas were situated in the village.

The Senior Manager expanded on the possible risks to the Council if the application was refused (listed clearly in the report) together with the two options that the Committee had.

1. Refuse the application on the grounds of over-development of the site in terms of building density. Refusing the application for 17 houses on this site (which corresponded to a building density of 24 houses per hectare in comparison with the density of 30 units per hectare which had been suggested both nationally and in the Unitary Development Plan) on the grounds of over-development would be very hard to justify, especially given that the site was located within the development boundary, on previously developed land, which had already received planning permission in 2010 for 17 houses. Refusing for this reason would pose a significant risk for the Council and would pose a significant and real risk of costs against the Council should the application go to appeal.
2. Refuse the application on the grounds that it was an over-development which would have an impact on the area's general amenities. In response to this refusal reason, it

was believed that the proposal as submitted for 17 houses would not have a detrimental impact on general amenities (including residential amenities along with visual amenities) considering the location and setting of the houses and their density in relation to nearby structures, together with the site's former industrial use and its current unkempt condition. A real risk of costs being claimed against the Council would remain should the application go to appeal.

It was recommended to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to the applicant signing a 106 legal agreement to ensure that two of the 17 proposed houses were affordable homes for general local need, and in accordance with the conditions.

- (b) The following main points were made by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee):-
- That he objected the application
  - Disagreement with the language assessment – he did not agree that the comment ‘that the previous language assessment’ was sufficient. This raised the question, had a second assessment been submitted?
  - The proposal would look out of place on the outskirts of the village in the middle of single units – the impact would be unacceptable.
  - Recognised that there were risks to the Council, but also consideration needed to be given to the risks to the village of Deiniolen and Gwynedd in terms of unnecessary houses.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application together with a request for a recorded vote.

- (c) During the discussion, the following observations were made:
- That the development was an over-development that would cause a detrimental impact on the community of Deiniolen as well as pressure on the Welsh language.
  - Rural communities and the Welsh Language had to be protected.
  - Developing houses was not tantamount to community development.
  - Was there a need for housing in Deiniolen?
  - Attention had to be given to the Local Member's comments
  - The number of affordable houses that would be part of the development was disappointing – five years had elapsed since the initial assessment – are two affordable houses still acceptable and was the expenditure still correct?
  - Would be happy to see four affordable houses and not two.
  - Need to build the correct type of houses as well as the correct number.
- (ch) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that:-
- They had to assess the information submitted. The main issues concerning the site were land drainage matters and therefore the site was difficult to develop. From the selling figures submitted, the houses would be likely to be affordable anyway.
- (d) In accordance with the Procedural Rules, the following vote to approve the application was a registered vote:

**In favour of the proposal to approve the application,** (5) Councillors: Gwen Griffith, Anne T. Lloyd Jones, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen and John Wyn Williams

**Abstained** (2) Councillors: Dyfrig Wynn Jones, John Pughe Roberts

**Against the proposal to approve the application,** (4) Councillors: Tudor Owen, Eirwyn

Williams, Owain Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to the applicant signing a 106 legal agreement to ensure that two of the 17 proposed houses are affordable homes for general local need, and in accordance with the following conditions:-**

1. **Standard conditions in relation to the commencement of the work/submitting details of reserved matters.**
2. **Natural slate.**
3. **NRW conditions.**
4. **Undertake a desktop survey to assess pollution risk (and any required work).**
5. **Highways conditions.**
6. **Welsh Water conditions.**
7. **Withdrawal of permitted rights from the affordable units**

**3. Application No. C14/0984/44/HD - Coliseum Cinema, High Street, Porthmadog**

Prior Notice of Demolition

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that this was an application for prior approval to demolish the former cinema and to clear the site. It appeared from the information received that it was not viable to retain the existing building. The building was currently in a relatively poor state of repair and the applicant was eager to demolish the building and clear the site before its condition deteriorated with the intention of redeveloping the site for commercial purposes.

In terms of evidence, there was no reason to refuse the application regarding the demolition method, however, consideration had to be given to, as well as receiving further information regarding how exactly this will be implemented. It was explained that the demolition of such a building constituted a 'development' therefore such plans fell under planning regulation. However; demolition was permitted under Section 31, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning Order (Permitted General Development) 1995 (as amended). This meant that formal planning permission was not required to demolish buildings if the developer was in compliance with the requirements of Section 31. The criteria required the applicant to issue a prior notice to the Local Planning Authority to determine if prior permission was required by the Authority for the demolition method and any restoration work proposed on the site. Consequently, the only considerations to be addressed here were the demolition method and the restoration work.

It was noted that a bats assessment had been received and neither the Council's Biodiversity Team nor Natural Resources Wales had any objections to the proposal provided the demolition work was completed in accordance with the recommendations of the bat report. Therefore, it was considered that the application complied with policy B20. It was added that the proposal was not contrary to any relevant policy and was unlikely to cause a detrimental impact on the local area's amenities or on nearby houses, road safety or protected species. Therefore, having received additional information on how exactly the demolition and restoration work would be implemented, the proposal was deemed to be acceptable for approval.

- (b) The following main points were made by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee):-
- Dwyfor District Council refused an application from the residents of Porthmadog in 1984 to support/assist in maintaining a cinema in the town. Objection to this application continued to be a sensitive issue to some of the town's residents.

- That the Coliseum had been a large part of the Porthmadog community.
- Many attempts had been made to retain the Coliseum and many volunteers had given their time to try and restore the building.
- Friends of the Coliseum were established in 2011; however, they had not managed to secure the Coliseum's future.
- There was sufficient evidence of the community's efforts to save the Coliseum.
- Request for support from Gwynedd Council to the arts would be discussed/take place in the future.

Proposed and seconded, with sadness, to approve the application.

- (c) During the discussion, the following main observations were made:
- Consider giving more time for Porthmadog residents to consider a scheme to save the building.
  - It was disappointing that Cadw had not listed the building which was a prominent feature and part of the Porthmadog streetscape.
  - Request that the developer safeguards the front of the building/incorporates in a new development.
  - The town had failed to maintain the building as a cinema, but it would be worthwhile to discuss with the developer if it was possible to retain the front of the building as a historical feature.
- (ch) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted:-
- That the application was unusual and he accepted the comment made regarding extending the time-schedule to try and save the building, despite this it was stressed that this was not a planning principle.
  - The principle of the application was to demolish in accordance with the relevant regulations – the characteristic design of the building may perhaps be considered in future plans.
  - That it was possible to submit a message from the Committee to the applicant to discuss further with the Town Council to consider deferring the demolition in order to give the community another chance to save the building.

An amendment to the proposal was made. To approve the application and send a letter with the approval stating that the Committee requested that they consider deferring the demolition in order to give the community another chance to save the building.

**RESOLVED subject to the receipt of an acceptable amended statement concerning the detailed method of demolition and restoration of the site, to approve the application and that a letter is sent with the permission stating that the Committee requests that they consider deferring the demolition in order to give the community another chance to save the building.**

#### **4. Application No. C15/0034/37/LL – Parc Elernion Caravan Park, Trefor**

Conversion of existing toilet block into a holiday accommodation unit, erection of a new toilet block, siting of two static caravans, siting of five touring caravans, associated parking area and landscaping.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the application's background and noted that there were several elements to the application that included:
- Conversion of existing toilet block into self-contained holiday accommodation
  - Building a toilet block /new facilities
  - Siting of one new static caravan
  - Siting five touring caravans (in place of five caravans with exemption certificates)



- Landscaping work including planting trees and creating hard standing areas for parking

It was added that the site was in a hidden area from nearby roads but was visible from higher ground within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Heritage Coast. It was explained that mature trees bordered the site on three sides, with an agricultural field on the other side. Public footpath number 9 Llanaelhaearn crossed the northern part of the site.

A discussion on this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning Committee on 06/07/15 at the request of the applicants in order to amend the plan to include one static caravan, rather than two.

In terms of the principle of the development, it was noted that Strategic Policy 17 in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan supported proposals to develop or improve the variety and quality of tourist facilities and attractions provided they did not significantly harm the environment, the area's cultural characteristics or the amenities of nearby residents. In addition, Policy D17 GUDP supported proposals to upgrade static holiday caravan sites if they conformed to a series of relevant criteria. It was noted that the application offered improvements to the quality and facilities of the site and the increase in the number of static units proposed was acceptable in terms of the relevant policies and the SPG.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- That the principle of the development was acceptable
  - The application conformed with policies 17, D17 and 18 that refer to improving variety and provision for tourism
  - That the application offered significant improvements – landscaping and appropriate screening to improve the visual element from higher ground and public footpaths.
  - Extended the choice /type of accommodation by protecting the building's character
  - Improved the provision in terms of toilets on the site
  - The improvements did not have a detrimental impact or visual impact on amenities

Proposed and seconded – to approve the application.

**RESOLVED to approve with conditions:**

1. **Five years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Materials for the buildings**
4. **Biodiversity conditions**
5. **Landscaping conditions**
6. **Touring caravans' standard holiday season**
7. **The unit will need to be taken from the site out of season**
8. **Holiday use only – static and touring caravans.**
9. **Must maintain a register of users**

**Notes for information:**

**Public Footpath Number 9 – Llanaelhaearn must be safeguarded  
Observations of the Flood Risk Management Unit  
Observations of Natural Resources Wales**

5. **Application No. C15/0337/11/AM – Plas Llwyd, High Street Bangor**

The discussion on the above application was chaired by Councillor Gwen Griffiths.

Outline application for the demolition of the existing building together with the erection of a new building containing a total of nine flats (6 x 1 bedroom and 3 x 2 bedroom).

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded on the application's background and noted that the proposal entailed the demolition of the existing building, together with the erection of a new building in its place to provide nine flats within the building. The proposal also provided five parking spaces within the curtilage of the building, together with bin storage and two clothes lines. In the application form it was noted that access, appearance, landscaping work, plan and scale formed part of this outline application and the proposed building was approximately the same height as the existing.

As the proposal provided nine new living units, a percentage of the units must be considered for affordable need. The general percentage was 30%, equivalent to three units in this case; the Strategic Housing Unit agreed that there was a need for affordable units and had agreed on the number and to offer a discount of 20% to ensure that they were affordable. This was based on the fact that the rent prices included in the Affordable Housing Statement were higher than what the Strategic Housing Unit considered to be affordable. The need for further information was noted regarding imposing a section 106 condition as the Planning Authority had not recently been asking CCG to complete a section 106 for new housing developments as this duplicated their lettings policy.

It was considered that the proposal complied with all relevant policies in the Unitary Development Plan and relevant national advice and that the proposal was not likely to cause significant detrimental effect on the amenities of the local area or on any neighbouring property.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application in accordance with the recommendation to delegate the right to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to ensuring arrangements regarding providing affordable housing and to relevant conditions.

- (b) During the discussion, the following main observations were made:
- Would the flats be provided for persons on the housing list?
  - Need assurance regarding who was the site's owner
  - If the site was released it had to be ensured that a 106 condition was included
  - That it was not necessary to consider who the applicant was
  - It had to be ensured that the flats were for local people
  - A request to defer in order to receive further information
- (c) In response to the above observations, the Solicitor noted:-
- It was an application for a housing development and for the Committee to delegate the right, subject to the completion of a 106 agreement, and if further information came to hand that CCG was the developer then the condition would have to be re-considered.
  - The link between CCG and Gwynedd Council was not relevant here. Considering who the applicant was was not a planning matter.

An amendment to the proposal was proposed and seconded to defer the application in order to receive further information.

**RESOLVED to defer the application in order to receive confirmation if Cartrefi**

**Cymunedol Gwynedd will be developing the site or not.****6. Application No. C15/0421/41/LL – Llety Plu, Llangybi, Pwllheli**

Extension to existing garage (a revised plan to that refused under application no. C15/0012/41/LL)

- (a) The Development Control Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that the application had been deferred at the Planning Committee dated 6 July 2015, at the request of the Local Member.

It was noted that it was an application for the extension of an existing garage at Llety Plu, Llangybi. The existing single garage measured approximately 6.3m long and approximately 5.1m wide (32m<sup>2</sup>) and was located in the corner of the property's curtilage. The Design and Access Statement elaborated that the reason for the extension would be to provide more room to store equipment and machinery which was part of the owner's collecting hobby. Planning permission had already been granted to extend the garage, namely application C13/0162/41/LL, which also included extending the curtilage of the site. The curtilage had already been extended but work had not commenced on the extension. The proposed extension was different in the sense that it was wider than the existing garage in the direction of the public footpath.

It was noted that this application was a re-submission of application C15/0012/41/LL for an additional extension which was slightly larger than the current application and requesting an additional floor area of 32m<sup>2</sup> (which would have meant a total floor area of 94m<sup>2</sup> for the whole garage). This application was refused in January this year for three reasons: Over-development of the site; Detrimental to the Conservation Area; Impact on Public Footpath No. 9 Llanystumdwy.

Attention was drawn to Policy B24 of the Unitary Development Plan that recommended approving the extension of buildings within development boundaries, rural villages and the countryside but only if the proposal met the two following criteria:

- That the design and scale were in keeping with the main building and the local area,
- That the extension would not lead to an unacceptable reduction in amenity space within the curtilage of the house.

Whilst it was realised that permission had already been granted for an extension to the garage, there was significant concern about the size and scale of the proposed extension bearing in mind that this was an ancillary building. The proposed extension to the garage was considered to be an over-development in terms of scale, size and form compared to the main building and was likely to have an impact on the setting of the conservation area and was also contrary to policies B4, B22 and B24 of the GUDP.

- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points: \_
- That describing the development as an 'alien' 'over-development' was rather going overboard
  - The area of the dwelling was sufficient to accommodate the size of the extension to the garage
  - 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 machinery.
  - Disagreed with the impact on visual amenities – the development conformed with

- the area's features and therefore did not impair on visual amenities
- Proposed that the Planning Committee visited the site prior to coming to a decision.

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

**RESOLVED to organise a site visit on the date of the next Planning Committee (Pwllheli).**

**7. Application No C15/0435/20/LL - Bron Menai, Helen Terrace, Y Felinheli**

Application to change the use of a three bedroom house to two 2 bedroom flats, together with demolishing a garage and creating three parking spaces and retaining planning application no. C08A/0420/20/LL for the construction of an additional house on the site

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that it was complex: it was a full application to change the use of a three bedroom house into two 2-bedroom flats along with demolishing an existing garage and creating three additional parking spaces. In addition, and within the same site, it was proposed to construct an additional house which was approved under reference no. C08A/0420/20/LL. It was noted that all the application's historical details had been included in the report. To all intents and purposes the proposal entailed developing a combination of the permissions already granted to enable the conversion of the existing property into two 2-bedroom flats and in order to develop a new three-bedroom house and associated parking for the three units all within the same site. It was also considered that the proposal conformed to the requirements of policies B22, B24 and B25 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan.

It was noted that objections had been received on the grounds of impact on privacy and light because of the proposal to construct a new two-storey house on the site. It was noted that these issues were discussed in the appeal decision and it stated that the character of the area, including the buildings that were close to each other in the form of terraces had been intermingled more recently with properties of various styles, sizes and plans and there was a substantial variety in the spatial arrangement of the buildings and the space surrounding them. Bearing in mind all the relevant issues, local and national policies, observations received on the application including the objection, it was considered that this proposal would not be unacceptable and as a result would satisfy policy requirements.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- Considering the application's history and background, the development had already been granted
  - The size of the unmodified development and was therefore totally suitable
  - It did not impact on the house opposite and therefore was not an over-development
  - There was no impact on visual amenities
  - Parking requirements continued to be the same although the parking area would be re-located within the site
  - Application to approve based on the recommendation of the Planning Officer
- (c) The following main points were made by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee):-
- The site/application had an extensive history and background
  - She was of the view that the development was an over-development
  - Sympathy with local residents regarding the uncertainty concerning the site

- The change of the parking areas was not acceptable bearing in mind that it was in close proximity to a dangerous corner
- However, in terms of tidying up planning permissions that approval was required but there was concern that two large buildings would be contained on a very small site.

Proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application**

**Conditions**

1. Time
2. Comply with plans

**8. Application No. C15/0603/20/CR - Menai Marina, Old Slate Quay, Y Felinheli**

A retrospective application to retain three closed security gates

- (a) The Development Control Officer expanded on the application's background and noted that it was a retrospective listed structure application to retain three closed security gates that were located on the harbour wall. It was noted that the three gates were located on the northern, southern and western wall, where existing ladders went down to the boats. Due to security issues, the gates had been installed around the ladders and were secured to the ground by means of four bolts. The three gates measured 2.2m in height and 1.8m and 1.6m long and were constructed of iron and painted black. Additional rails were located around the quay along with maritime equipment which had been installed on the quay side. The site was part of the existing marina which was located in Felinheli. The harbour wall was a grade II listed structure. The site was within a C2 Flooding Zone.
- (b) Reference was made to objections received regarding the impact of the gates on the public's enjoyment of the marina. Despite the fact that the existing gates were quite large on the site, the context of the site must be considered as a whole – the site was part of an operational marina with substantially sized boats and all the associated equipment and sailing activities that were seen all around. For these reasons, the gates did not appear to be out of place on this site or as having a detrimental effect on the character of the listed wall. The gates were associated with the existing rails and were acceptable in that context also. It was not considered that approving the application would have a detrimental effect on the appearance or historic character of the listed structure or the amenities of the wider area and, therefore, it was considered that the proposal was in accordance with policies B2 and B3 of the GUDP.
- (c) The justification for the gates stated that they were a vital part of securing health and safety in the marina and they blended into their background and all the current sailing activities that could be seen.

Proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**RESOLVED to approve in accordance with the recommendation.**

The meeting commenced at 1pm and concluded at 3:10pm

---

**CHAIRMAN**