

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 15/01/18

---

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

**Councillors:** Stephen Churchman, Simon Glyn, Louise Hughes, Sian Wyn Hughes, Berwyn Parry Jones, Eric M. Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Dilwyn Lloyd, Edgar Wyn Owen, Catrin Wager, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams.

**Others invited:** Councillors Dewi Wyn Roberts, Dafydd Owen and John Brynmor Hughes (Local Members).

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Planning Manager), Glyn Llewelyn Gruffudd (Senior Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Officer - Transport), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Lowri H. Evans (Member Support Officer).

**Apologies:** None to note

### 1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

- (a) Councillor Catrin Wager declared a personal interest, in item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0903/16/LL) as she was a friend of the applicant.

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

- (b) The following members declared that they were local members in relation to the items noted:
- Councillor Dewi Wyn Roberts (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1024/39/LL)
  - Councillor Dafydd Owen (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0903/16/LL).
  - Councillor Eirwyn Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.3 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0912/35/AM);
  - Councillor Stephen Churchman (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.6 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1077/36/LL).
  - Councillor Huw G. W. Jones (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.8 on the agenda (planning application number C17/1124/11/LL).
  - Councillor John Brynmor Hughes (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.9 on the agenda (planning application C17/1144/39/LL).

The Members withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussion 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, that took place on 18 December 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 policy aspects.

**RESOLVED****1. Application Number C17/1024/39/LL - The Shanty, Pen Bennar, Abersoch, Pwllheli, Gwynedd**

Demolition of house to be replaced with a three-storey house

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received, which included the response of the AONB Joint Committee.

- a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that it had been submitted to the Planning Committee on 18/12/2017, where it was resolved to defer consideration on the application in order to obtain the opinion of the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Joint Advisory Committee. It was elaborated that the application was a re-submission of an application that had been refused by the Planning Committee on 25 September 2017.

It was noted that the applicant had amended the proposal by reducing the size of the proposed house in response to concerns raised by the Committee and the refusal reasons of the previous application. It was expressed that the interior layout of the building had been altered in order to reduce the surface area of the building by 25%. Detailed plans were submitted along with photographs showing the proposed house and the exterior terraces extending back to follow the site's profile. It was suggested that the building would not create an intrusive development in the landscape and although the appearance of the house was different, it was not considered that it would have a significant harmful impact on the landscape. The Members were reminded that the site was located on Abersoch headland, outside the village development boundary and within the AONB.

It was emphasised that the proposal would involve demolishing the existing house on the site and erecting a larger new house in its place. It was noted that local and national policies supported re-using previously used land for developments, and it was considered that the proposal met the requirements of policy TAI 13 of the LDP which specifically involved demolishing and erecting a new house within the village boundary. With a house already existing on the site, the proposal would not involve creating new residential unit(s) and, consequently, the development would not add to the housing stock. The Council's Conservation Officer confirmed that the current building was not of historical or architectural value and that it did not justify listed status.

It was reported that there were many differently designed houses in the area and there was no typical building pattern. With an appearance that would be visible from the sea, it was considered that the design of the proposal, from looking at it from the sea, blended in with the site because it followed the shape, layout and profile of the site and the use of materials that created a light design. It was explained that the design, although modern, it was of a scale and of materials that would be in keeping with the site and suitable to its location and context. It was noted that the AONB Unit had no objection to the proposal, however, the Joint Committee had stated that the proposal would be an over-development on a prominent site with a substantially larger footprint than the existing house. The Joint Committee also noted that the development would be intrusive.

Having weighed up the proposal in the context of the relevant policies and the objectors' arguments, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable for approval. As there was a dwelling on the site already, there would be no substantial change to the landscape or any significant substantial impact on the amenities of nearby residents.

- b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), objected, noting the following main points:
- Local concern that the proposal was an over-development and that it would not suit the site;

- Despite the changes made to the original plans, the house continued to be three-storays and larger than the footprint of the original house;
  - A letter was read reporting the observations and concerns of the Llŷn AONB Joint Advisory Committee.
  - The Committee was asked to refuse the application based on over-development and the negative impact on the AONB.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application in accordance with the recommendation.
- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual Members:
- It was appreciated that the applicant had co-operated with the requirements of the officers and the Committee to reduce the size and impact
  - The design was good, innovative and in keeping with the landscape. The nearby houses had no construction pattern
  - The development was substantially larger than what already existed on the site
  - The development was obtrusive and would be detrimental to the beauty of the headland.
  - Approving would set a precedent for others to buy an old house and modify it into a modern house which would be hostile for local people
  - The applicant had asked for more than what he required in order to appear as if he was willing to compromise when proposing a reduction in the scale of the development.
  - There was an insufficient reduction in size
  - There was a statutory duty to protect the AONB and therefore the observations of the Joint Committee needed to be prioritised.
- d) In response to the observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager highlighted the fact that the discussion had been interesting and valuable and reflected the difference of opinion on the design of the development. With the site within the development boundary, there is no restriction to building size or a policy asking for surface area difference. The Members were encouraged to consider the observations of the AONB officer, as well as the advice of the planning officers, in considering that the application overcame reasons for refusal - was there a significant impact to this given that the applicant had already reduced the size? It was added that the Committee's role was to weigh up the information that had been submitted.
- dd) In response to an observation regarding the possibility that the applicant would appeal against the decision to refuse, and possible appeal against the decision on the original plan, which was larger in terms of size, it was reiterated that this was possible.
- e) A vote was taken on the proposal. The proposal fell.
- f) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application based on the observations of the Llŷn AONB Joint Advisory Committee.

**RESOLVED to refuse.**

**Reason:**

**The proposal would be an over-development of a prominent site with a substantially larger footprint than the existing house and would create an intrusive development that would have a detrimental impact on views into, out and across the AONB.**

**2. Application number C17/0903/16/LL – Carreg y Fedwen, Sling, Tregarth, Bangor,**

Creation of sacred healing acoustic research and enterprise centre including the erection of four new buildings, the formation of parking areas and erection of 2.3m high boundary wall (revised application to one previously withdrawn - C16/1158/16/LL)

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received

- a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the application's background. It was noted that the applicant had highlighted that the description of the proposal was slightly different to what he considered to be accurate. It was therefore highlighted that the wording of the proposal would be amended to, '*Creation of a Research Centre which includes the erection of four new buildings...*' It was added that the plans were correct and the description of the proposal in the report was correct, but the formal description was slightly incorrect.

It was reported that this was an application to create a new research centre that would research the use of sound for body and mind healing. It was noted that the site will consist of a main domed acoustic building connected, via a corridor, to an entrance building which will consist of a greeting area and office. There would be three further domed buildings, of a smaller size, designed to resonate with specific sound wavelengths. It was explained that this was an application for a small new rural enterprise that would offer employment opportunities for between two and five people. It would also provide an opportunity to diversify the local rural economy and would be a means of using the previously used site for business purposes. It was considered that the principle of the proposal met with the aims of Policy PS13.

With the site of this application being in an isolated location in a mixed woodland, it was reported that the buildings, because of their size and materials, would be in-keeping with the site and would be hidden from distant vistas. It was considered that the screening offered by the land formation and existing vegetation would be sufficient to satisfactorily screen the site. No significant harm to the quality of life for nearby residents was expected from this low level of activity and, because of its distance from other dwellings, it was not believed that any significant harm would derive from the site in terms of matters such as overlooking or shadowing. It was considered that the proposal, from the development's nature and scale, was acceptable for the location. In response to concerns from local residents regarding the possible impact of noise created by the facility's activities, it was expressed that Public Protection had confirmed that they had no objection to the small enterprise, but they had proposed appropriate conditions.

It was reported that the proposal was not contrary to any material planning policy within the LDP and that the proposed development was an appropriate use of the site.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:
- The building was sustainable, having been built by hand
  - The enterprise would focus on acoustic research, inspired by proposed methods that are central to healing a brain injury
  - Two to five jobs would be created - initial discussions with Bangor University, Hull University and other research centres with regards to a PhD in innovative research
  - It would increase local sustainable employment in construction by offering an apprenticeship or similar schemes
  - The development would have a low visual impact, which would be in keeping with the environment
  - Specific acoustic features had been encoded in the design
  - The application represented all Sustainable Gwynedd core characteristics
  - It would create jobs for local people
  - It would increase health and well-being and the ability to work globally
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:
- That the site was outside the local development boundary
  - A number of elements in the application was subject to grants
  - The design was alien for the countryside - an eyesore and a mindsore
  - Needed to consider what the building would be used for if grants were not awarded
  - Anticipated that the enterprise would impact the residents of the area

- The road and the access was very narrow
- The word 'enterprise' opened the door for any activity
- What was the significance of the impact of wavelengths? Had this been investigated further? Had the applicant submitted any information?
- Would the wavelengths impact on horses? There was a bridleway nearby
- Concern that Bangor University did not acknowledge the enterprise
- The application was vague and misleading.

ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

d) An amendment was proposed and seconded to:

- defer the decision as more information about the observations of Public Protection and Bangor University was needed.
- carry out a site visit as questions had been raised about the use of the narrow road.

During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual Members:

- The idea was acceptable but more assurance was needed about the project's development
- The opportunity seemed to be exciting but it needed to be ensured that things were done properly
- Needed to consider the access concerns.

**RESOLVED to defer the application in order to**

- **Carry out a site visit to see the road network**
- **Consider the information from Public Protection**
- **Consider the information regarding the link with the University**

**3. Application number C17/0912/35/AM – Station Bakery, High Street, Cricieth.**

A resubmission of an application approved under C12/0476/35/AM to demolish existing buildings and erect seven residential units

a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the application's background and noted that it was a resubmission because the previous approval had ended. It was highlighted that this was an outline application including access, landscape and scale details only. It was emphasised that the principle of this development was mainly under consideration, rather than the full details.

It was reported that the site was located within the development boundary of Cricieth and within an area where there was a mixture of commercial units and private housing. It was noted that the proposal was for the erection of seven residential units, and confirmation had been received that the applicant was willing to offer two of those units as affordable units. These two units would be subject to a 106 agreement to ensure their future affordability.

It was noted that the proposal was acceptable and was a good use of the site. It was unlikely to have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the local area or on any nearby property.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (a member of this Planning Committee), noted that he had no objection to the application or to the recommendation.

c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

ch) In response to an observation regarding an application submitted after five years as the time within the previous application had ended, it was emphasised that there were no enforcement rights to force applicants to act.

d) In response to an observation from the Biodiversity Unit that these houses should include swift bricks, it was highlighted that these bricks encouraged birds to nest.

**RESOLVED to delegate the right to approve subject to completing a 106 Agreement to bind two of the seven properties as affordable housing for local need with relevant conditions involving:**

1. Time
2. Reserved Matters
3. Slate
4. Welsh Water
5. Highways/Parking
6. Working hours when developing the site
7. Windows
8. Withdrawal of permitted rights from the affordable units
9. Finished floor levels
10. Boundary treatments / landscaping

**4. Application number C17/0933/15/LL - DMM Engineering International, Ffatri y Glyn, Y Glyn Industrial Estate, Llanberis, Caernarfon**

Demolition of existing industrial buildings and erection of 2 no. extensions to industrial building and associated alterations to existing building and erection of 1 no. new freestanding storage and processing building.

- a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application was for the improvement of the DMM factory buildings in Llanberis so that the company could provide better facilities, include new machinery and improve the existing production processes. It was explained that there were many elements to the plan:
- Demolition of existing structures that were linked to the main building in two locations
  - Erection of two new extensions to the rear of the main building to replace the structures to be demolished
  - Removal of storage containers from the site
  - Construction of new building for storing and processing

With the development located within an industrial estate, it was added that its size was acceptable and due to its nature, it was not considered that there would be any significant harmful impact on private amenities or on the amenities of the neighbourhood in general. It was noted that the proposal was a suitable economic development for the area.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- c) During the ensuing discussion the following points were highlighted by individual members:
- that the company employed a number of people
  - that the development was located within an industrial estate

**RESOLVED to approve**

**Conditions:**

1. Five years.
2. Development to comply with the approved plans.
3. Contaminated land condition
4. Welsh Water Condition

**5. Application number C17/1090/45/LL - Partington Marine Boatyard, Yr Harbwr, Pwllheli**

Demolish existing covered boat storage area and workshop following storm damage and construct a new workshop and boat storage area.

- a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that it was an application to construct a new workshop and boat storage area following recent storm damage. It was explained that as the building on the site was in a dangerous structural condition, this building had already been demolished.

It was noted that this site was located within the development boundary of Pwllheli and within a Landscape of Historic Interest and was located in the Pwllheli outer harbour area in which a number of boat yards and workshops were to be found. It was emphasised that the application had been submitted to Committee as it fell within the category of a commercial, industrial or retail development over 500m<sup>2</sup>.

It was considered that the use, design and proposed materials were acceptable and that they would not impair the amenities, character or appearance of the site, nor the surrounding area.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**RESOLVED To approve – conditions:**

1. **Commencement within five years.**
2. **Development to comply with the submitted plans.**
3. **Agree to the exact colours of the exterior materials.**
4. **No surface water and/or land drainage to connect with the public sewer.**

**6. Application number C17/1077/36/LL - Land near Tŷ'n Ffrwd, Pentrefelin, Cricieth**

A retrospective planning application to retain a vehicular access

- a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that it was a retrospective application for the retention of a vehicular access. It was reported that the access was off a class 1 road, namely the A497 in Pentrefelin.

It was not considered that the proposal of creating the access would have a detrimental impact on the area's visual amenities. It was emphasised that many of the objectors had voiced concerns involving road safety, however, the Transportation Unit had not raised any concerns that would derive from the development. Everyone was reminded that this was an access for the maintenance of agricultural land with low density use. It was noted that the access was very similar to similar accesses nearby

It was emphasised that should any planning applications be submitted for further developments in the future, those planning applications would be considered on their own merits. It was considered that the site was suitable for an agricultural access and that there were no implications in terms of road safety. Also, it was not considered that the proposal, given its scale and location, would detrimentally affect the amenities of neighbouring residents.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following points:
- The applicant needed to look after the land and to do so, he required occasional access to the land
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:
- The application appeared to be clear and simple, but that there was a need to consider the application further
  - The entrance was located on a section of the road which had a bend
  - The access was very close to quite a busy junction in the village and bus stop. These appeared to be complications on a small section of the road
  - It was accepted that the gate was similar to others in the area but, again, problems arose with security
  - The gate could not be opened out as it would open to the road and across a public footpath

- It could not be opened fully into the land due to the proximity to the river - it was therefore impractical
  - The main concerns for the residents of the village was road safety - the access would add to these concerns
- ch) In response to observations made about the road safety concerns, the Senior Development Control Officer highlighted that the size of the parcel of land was insufficient for large agricultural machinery and therefore the application had been considered for smaller machinery such as a 4x4 vehicle. It was emphasised that use of the access would be occasional and he did not object to the application. There was no reason to set the gate back
- d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- dd) During the ensuing discussion the following points were highlighted: by individual members:
- What was the size of the parcel of land? Was it agricultural land within the development boundary?
  - Had the plot been registered as agricultural land?
  - Was this an application to place an access for the future?
  - Access must be gained to the land to treat it
- e) In response to the observation with regard to land use, it was noted that land was not recognised as a garden or plot and the land was currently being used for agricultural purposes. It was noted that it was entirely reasonable that an access be available to service the land. In response to a question regarding the size of the plot and its location within the development boundary, it was emphasised that this was not a material consideration for the application.

**RESOLVED to approve**

1. **In accordance with plans**
2. **Low kerbs in accordance with the details submitted to be placed on the site within three months of the approval date;**
3. **A gate to open into the site only and a clear structure must be set on the access to ensure this within three months of the approval date.**

**7. Application number C17/1101/13/LL - Bethesda Rugby Club, Dôl Dafydd, Station Road, Bethesda**

Full planning application for the construction of five bungalows for social letting and twelve houses for social letting, and adaptations to the existing entrance and access road

- a) The Planning Manager referred to the late observations form, emphasising that the Planning Service had received advice from Welsh Government (Economy and Infrastructure Department) expressing that the planning application could not be approved as the applicant had not submitted sufficient information (based on submitting a Departure from Standard application to Welsh Government) regarding the work that needed to be carried out to the junction between the A5 and Station Road.
- b) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application.

**RESOLVED to defer**

**8. Application number C17/1124/11/LL - Marketing Suite, Y Bae, Beach Road, Bangor, LL57 2SE**

Variation of condition 2 of planning permission C16/0229/11/LL in order for the temporary marketing suite to remain on site for an additional two years

Attention was drawn to the late observations forms



- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that this was an application to amend a condition on the previous planning permission (C16/0299/11/LL) in order to extend the period for placing a temporary marketing suite on site for an additional two years. It was explained that two time extensions had already been granted, the latest with permission running until 31/03/18.
- It was noted that the building was used as a housing sales centre associated with the residential development in Y Bae in Bangor. It was noted that the housing development had been completed but it was understood that two units remained on the market. It was hoped to have an extension of an additional two years until all the units would be sold.
- It was reported that the cabin was located within the development boundary of Bangor and was of a reasonable size and location. It was not considered that the cabin, or its occasional use, would have a significant detrimental impact on the amenities of the nearby residents.
- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following points:
- The purpose of the building was to assist with the marketing and sales element of the units in Phase 1 of the development
  - Two units were still for sale
  - The building was fit for purpose and was used to meet potential buyers
  - It did not create an adverse visual impact
  - Any observations or discussions on phase 2 of the development would be treated as a separate application
- (c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:
- The marketing cabin was not being used
  - The member suspected that it had been closed for two months
  - The two units that were still for sale were being sold through local estate agents
  - Local residents suspected that this application for a time extension to the cabin was for phase 2 of the development in Y Bae
  - The building was unnecessary - it no longer served a purpose
- ch) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application, contrary to the recommendation, as it no longer served a purpose.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual Members:
- If there were only two units left for sale, why was there a need for a period of an additional two years?
  - Would it be possible to consider a shorter period?
  - What if the company appealed the decision?
- dd) In response to the observation for a shorter period, it was reported that the marketing cabin had planning permission up until the end of March 2018. If there was no further permission, the building would be moved. If the building was not moved, enforcement steps would be taken. In the context of appeal, it was noted that the company would have the right to appeal the decision. It was noted that the most evident concern was the need.
- e) It was proposed and seconded to reduce the period to six months from March 2018 onwards
- f) The Solicitor highlighted the fact that the original proposer needed to consider the new proposal, and if he accepted it, the consent of the seconder and the Committee would be required to withdraw the original proposal. On this basis, the original proposal withdrew his proposal. The seconder agreed to do this.
- ff) It was voted to withdraw the proposal of refusal. The Committee agreed to withdraw the original proposal.

- g) It was proposed and seconded to reduce the need for the marketing cabin from two years to six months

**RESOLVED: Approve - conditions**

1. In accordance with the plans
2. The unit must be removed within six months from 31.3.18

**9. Application number C17/1144/39/LL - Tŷ Hir Caravan Park, Mynytho, Pwllheli**

Site two additional static caravans to increase numbers from 17 to 19 and construction of an earth bank

- a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of this application, and noted that this was an application to site two additional static caravans on the site together with additional landscaping which would include the construction of a bank and reinforcing the existing vegetation. It was highlighted that two similar applications had already been refused during 2017. It was noted that the existing static site had planning permission for 17 units. There was also a site for touring caravans located at Tŷ Hir, authorised via a legal use certificate application in 2013. It was noted that the site was located within a Special Landscape Area and a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest, and was submitted to Committee at the request of the local member.

In the context of the principle of the development, it was explained that the main policy to consider when assessing the development was policy TWR 3 – part 3. It was added that this policy may permit small extensions to the site's surface and /or re-locating units from prominent locations to less prominent locations subject to compliance with criteria. One of the criteria was that the improvements did not lead to an increase in the number of static caravans or chalet units on the site, unless, in exceptional circumstances, the proposals would involve relocating existing sites located within the Coastal Change Management Area. The policy did not allow an increase in the number of static caravans on sites within the AONB or the Special Landscape Areas. It was noted that the proposal involved increasing the numbers of units on site by adding two units. The proposal did not comply with the requirements of Policy TWR 3 in terms of sites within the Special Landscape Area.

It was acknowledged that the development demonstrated some improvements to the facilities of the current static site, and that the additional landscaping would improve the appearance and the environment of the site. Nevertheless, attention was drawn to paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 of the report, and it was emphasised that any landscaping plan, improvements or exchanging the touring units for static units would not overcome the fact that the Policy did not permit increasing the number of caravans on sites within a Special Landscape Area.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following points:
- The request is only two additional static units
  - The content of the policies and the report was acknowledged but there was a real possibility to adjust the application to comply with the policy
  - Two static caravans had been added in 2014, but it was decided not to increase further - they did not know at the time that the Local Development Plan would prevent a further increase in numbers
  - There was a possible shortcoming by the officers in terms of sharing information about the changes
  - The two additional units would be located in a concealed site
  - It was accepted that there was a possibility to relocate the static units to the lower end of the site or to exchange a static unit for a touring unit
  - This was a local business was responding to the demand
  - The business was making the most of tourism in order to ensure a successful boom in the countryside

- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) made the following points:-
- Reference was made to point 3 of Policy TWR 3
  - This was one site in two fields - it was proposed to move two units from one field to the other.
  - The site was tidy and was being managed well
  - The visitors supported local businesses
  - The business was run by a local family
  - It was suggested to defer the application and hold a site visit.
- ch) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual Members:
- The applicant may have been misled with the amendments to the new Local Development Plan
  - A site visit would be of advantage.
  - No objections had been received from the Transportation Unit
  - There was no major difference between 17 and 19 units
- dd) A proposal for an amendment to undertake a site visit was made and seconded.
- e) It was voted to carry out a site visit. The proposal fell.
- f) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation.
- ff) During the ensuing discussion, the following points were highlighted by individual members:
- It had been refused twice last year
  - After years of creating new policies, the member would not want to contradict them at the first opportunity
  - Was it not required to ensure that the conditions of previous applications were implemented before submitting a new application?
  - On what grounds was the application submitted to the Committee? A valid planning reason was required to do this

In response to an observation regarding the validity of exchanging two static units with two touring caravans, it was initially noted that the touring site and the static site were considered as two separate sites as referred to in the report. Exchanging touring units for static ones would not be acceptable because the scale proposed was one for one and this was unacceptable. In circumstances where an exchange had been supported in the past, the exchange scale was much higher and a clear planning improvement would be proposed, e.g. in terms of transportation improvements.

## **RESOLVED**

### **To refuse -**

**The proposal involves increasing the number of static caravans on an existing static caravan site within a Special Landscape Area. Policy TWR 3 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan does not allow an increase in the number of static caravans or chalet units on existing sites within a Special Landscape Area. The proposal is, therefore, contrary to Policy TWR 3 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (July 2017).**

The meeting commenced at 1.00pm and concluded at 3.45pm.

---

**CHAIR**