PLANNING COMMITTEE 13-12-21

Present: Chair: Councillor Eric M Jones

Councillors: Stephen Churchman, Elwyn Edwards, Simon Glyn, Anne Lloyd Jones, Berwyn Parry Jones, Gareth T Jones, Huw Wyn Jones, Louise Hughes, Edgar Owen, Eirwyn Williams and Owain Williams

Officers: Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Department - Planning and the Environment), Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Services), Keira Sweenie (Planning Manager), Gwawr Hughes (Development Control Team Leader), Idwal Williams (Senior Development Control Officer), Rhys Cadwaladr (Enforcement Officer) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer)

Others invited:

Local Members: Councillors Peter Read, Judith Humphreys, Annwen Daniels, Aled Wyn Jones, Peter Garlick and Catrin Wager

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Gareth A Roberts, Councillor Dilwyn Lloyd and Councillor Mair Rowlands (Local Member for application 5.7)

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

a) Councillor Owain Williams in items 5.1 (C21/0106/40/LL), 5.9 (C21/0411/46/LL) and 5.10 (C21/0768/42/11) on the agenda, as he was the owner of a caravan site.

Councillor Berwyn Parry Jones in item 5.4 (C21/0979/11/AC) on the agenda, as he was a member of the Adra Board.

The members were of the view that it was a prejudicial interest, and they withdrew from the meeting during the discussion on the applications.

b) The following members declared that they were local members in relation to the items noted:
- Councillor Peter Read (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.1 (C21/0106/40/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Judith Humphreys (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.2 (C21/0430/22/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Annwen Daniels (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.3 (C21/0257/03/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Aled Wyn Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.5 (C21/0668/43/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Peter Read (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.6 (C21/0835/19/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Catrin Wager (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.7 (C20/0669/11/LL) on the agenda
- Councillor Eirwyn Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.8 (C21/0569/35/AC) on the agenda
- Councillor Simon Glyn (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.9 (C21/0411/46/LL) on the agenda

3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

4. MINUTES

The Chair accepted the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 22 November 2021, as a true record.

5. 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

5.1. **APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0106/40/LL Fferm Llwyndyrys, Llwyndyrys, Pwllheli, Gwynedd**

Change of use of land for the siting of 10 holiday pods along with changes to the current access, creation of passing places, creation of internal access road and landscaping.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the application's background, noting that this was a full application that intended to change the use of a section of existing agricultural land for the siting of 10 new permanent pods or holiday cabins and the creation of a new access road, creation of parking spaces and associated footpaths, creation of passing places for vehicles on the nearby public road, creation of a new footpath, new landscaping and drainage systems. It was explained that the site lay in the open countryside and within the designation of the Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest with access along a narrow, winding, unclassified road which was approximately 900m from the junction with the A499.

   Members were reminded that this application was deferred at the committee dated 4 October 2021 after a request for the officers to conduct a further assessment of additional information received from the agent. It was reported that the officers had assessed the application and that the report submitted conveyed the findings. However, no amendments were submitted to any element of the plan and therefore, as in the original report, it was the officers' view to refuse the application due to issues of sustainability and visual impact.

   The site was considered to be far from the A499 and although the applicant intended to install a footpath for visitors to walk to a bus stop, it was not considered that there would be regular use of the footpath, anticipating that visitors would use their cars to travel back and forth. In the context of visual amenities, it was argued that the site was located on open and prominent agricultural green land with the proposed new road and parking spaces likely to create an alien feature in the fields and harmful to the visual amenities of the area.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:
   - The application possibly set a planning precedent - although the proposed cabins were attractive and of a high standard, it was considered that the LDP had not

anticipated applications for two-storey cabins. A development such as this could spread to less suitable sites and indeed to caravan parks.

- Although the amended application recognised the ancient status of the adjacent woodland, concern was expressed that the 15 metre space was insufficient as a buffer zone given that the woodland protected the visual elements of the application.
- The trees had, to a large extent, lost a regenerative layer. If the application were approved, the need for a robust woodland replanting and regeneration scheme should be noted which would include excluding access for humans and animals.
- The development adopted the LDP's current vision of protecting and enhancing the cultural and historic landscapes of the Llŷn Peninsula by protecting listed and traditional buildings and a patchwork of fields, lanes, stone walls and earth banks. There was a suggestion that the traditional earth banks be extended to form the sides of the new access road (from the Grade II farmhouse to the new car park). This would reduce the 'openness' of the current situation as well as reduce the impact of car lights and create a green corridor that would preserve and enhance the landscape - in terms of health and safety, traffic would be calmed, and livestock protected by being segregated from using the same space as vehicles and pedestrians.
- The observations were helpful - echoing the LDP's aim of promoting excellence in the development area as well as preserving its unique culture and heritage for present and future generations.

c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following observations:

- Retaining the farm's character was important to him.
- An old hen house on the farm was the guide for the holiday cabins.
- The cabins would be made of a light-coloured wood - merging into the background naturally.
- The height of the roof ridge of the proposed cabins was 3.6 metres, which was equivalent to the height of the earth bank. The cabins would not be visible from the west and the forest would screen them from the north.
- From the south and east, the site was not visible due to the level of the landscape - the tops of some electricity poles and rural views could be seen in the distance.
- The future of agriculture was confusing and worrying at the moment because of Brexit and Covid - the Welsh Government's recommendation was to diversify into this area.
- He was eager to secure a future in his locality.
- He intended to supply breakfast hampers using local Welsh produce from the Llwyndyrys area - neighbouring 'Welsh Lady' jam and 'Cefn Pentre' vegetables, South Caernarfon Creameries' milk and cheese, Llwyndyrys meat and eggs, and hoped to grow wheat to bake his own bread.
- Without the holiday cabins, the dream was not sustainable. Should the application be successful, he could secure a future for himself in his locality, educate visitors about the importance of 'Farm to Fork', create product preparation work, promote quality Welsh produce and develop and support the language.
- According to an officer, 'the scale of the visual impact of the development is a matter of opinion'.
- He implored the Committee to support this new initiative.

ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:

- He was supportive of the application.
- Concerns about Brexit and payments to farmers put pressure on them to diversify.
- The holiday cabins were built in north Wales.
- The cabins might be visible from the summit of Tre Ceiri but not from the main road.

- The cabins were likely to attract 'alternative' visitors who liked the outdoors - cycle route 47 ran near the site.
- The LDP had not taken the context/impact of Brexit, Covid and Farmers' Payments into account.
- It was possible to build walls as suggested by the objector.

d) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

dd) During the ensuing discussion the following points were made by members:

- Refusing the application would be unfair - it was difficult to make a living from farming - the advice was to diversify.
- Tourism sustained communities.
- It was a matter of opinion that it was unsustainable - narrow and winding lanes were typical of Llŷn.
- The site was concealed - mature hedgerows.
- Wooden cabins were consistent with the character - better than caravans.
- The cabins were standard ones, tasteful and suited the rural environment.
- The Community Council supported the application.

In response to a comment on whether it would be possible to position the cabins closer to the farm to comply with relevant policies, it was noted that this was possible but if there was a significant change a new application would need to be submitted. Despite this, issues relating to an unsustainable site would remain.

e) A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse the application.

The proposal fell.

A vote was taken on the proposal to approve the application.

RESOLVED to approve

Conditions:

5 years
in accordance with the plans
complete landscaping
holiday use only
install units of the type that are indicated on the plans
creation of passing places

5.2 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0430/22/LL Land opposite Oxton Villa, Ffordd Haearn Bach, Penygroes

Application for erecting an affordable dwelling with access, parking and associated landscaping

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application for erecting a single-storey affordable dwelling with access and a parking space, together with associated landscaping and a substantial curtilage. The site was located within an agricultural field on the outskirts of the village of Penygroes along a narrow road that turned into a public footpath at the far end - the public footpath ran between the field that was the subject of the application and the last house in the village (Glaslyn).

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee on 12.07.2017, where it was decided to defer the application in order to receive further information regarding the following:

- A valuation of the proposal.
- Confirmation of the applicant's current need in terms of the number of bedrooms, and the applicant's situation.
- Confirmation of whether the applicant had considered providing another affordable unit on the site, as it was substantial.
- Confirmation of whether the applicant was prepared to sign a local person affordable housing 106 Agreement should the Planning Committee decide to permit the application.

It was explained that the applicant had provided a response to the above.

It was noted that there was a gap between the site and the development boundary (which appeared as a public footpath) and in terms of planning policy the site had been defined as being in the open countryside and had been considered in terms of Policy TAI 16 'Exception Sites', which was supported in the Supplementary Planning Guidance, 'Affordable Housing'.

It was reported that the proposed dwelling was being proposed as an affordable dwelling, with confirmation from Tai Teg that the applicant was suitable for an affordable property. It was added that the application's agent had confirmed that the applicant currently had need for two bedrooms, with the intention of having a family within the floor area of the proposed property. It was highlighted that the internal floor area of the two bedroom, single-storey dwelling was approximately 50 square metres greater than the maximum specified in the Supplementary Planning Guidance for an affordable two bedroom, single-storey dwelling, and the height of the main roof-space meant there was potential to provide an additional floor above part of the dwelling in future. It was noted that the applicant had intended to have his family within the property without the need for an extension, but it was not clear what were his actual intentions as only two bedrooms were proposed.

A red book valuation had been presented for the property and the Strategic Housing Unit had confirmed that in terms of affordability, a 45% discount would bring the level down which was reasonable for a new intermediate single property. Despite this, there was concern about the price of property and/or land that could increase significantly in the future to a level where it could be argued that the property was not affordable whatever the discount, and that an application may be submitted to lift the 106 Agreement. It was noted that the LDP supported proposals for affordable units where it could be ensured that they remained affordable in perpetuity.

It was considered that the proposal for erecting one affordable dwelling was unacceptable, and was contrary to the requirements of policies PCYFF 1, TAI 15, TAI 16, the Affordable Housing SPG and TAN 6 in respect of the site's eligibility as an exception site and the need for a new house in open countryside, the size of the curtilage, together with the lack of confirmation of the number of bedrooms that would satisfy the need/size of the property.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:

- She was supportive of the application.

- It was a special opportunity for the applicant to build a home on a parcel of land that was owned by his family - a sustainable home, a stone's throw from the home where he was raised.
- He worked locally - the location of the home was convenient.
- The width of the public footpath was half a metre - Were these reasonable grounds for noting 'outside the boundary' and preventing the opportunity for a local person to have a home in the area?
- There were no local objections to the proposal.
- The application responded to the requirements of Policy TAI16.
- Tai Teg had confirmed that the person was eligible.
- The development did not stand alone - it bordered a row of houses.
- The applicant was prepared to sign a 106 Agreement.
- A valuation report had been submitted in accordance with the criteria.
- This was an opportunity to help and support a young person to live in his local community.

c) A proposal was made to approve the application and it was seconded.

ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:

- The development was not in the countryside - there were other houses nearby.
- The size of the house represented an affordable dwelling.
- Although living alone at the moment, he was planning for the future.

- The need for local housing for local people was accepted, but the house was too large for an individual.
- There was enough space on the site to build three affordable houses.

In response to a question regarding reducing the size of the house and curtilage to overcome the affordability element, the Assistant Head noted that the house in question had been regarded as a family home and therefore highlighted the need to consider affordability because one person would be living in the house. The Monitoring Officer added that the application was 'an individual's application' and not a 'family application'.

d) A vote was taken on the proposal to approve the application.

The proposal fell.

A vote was taken on the proposal to refuse the application.

RESOLVED to refuse the application

REASONS

1. **The proposal is not appropriate as a logical extension to the settlement because of its location and the current boundaries that separate the settlement from the countryside in this location. The development is therefore contrary to the requirements of policies PCYFF 1, TAI 15 and 16 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026 and the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Affordable Housing which ensure suitable affordable housing developments as an exception on the peripheries of development boundaries.**

2. **The size of the proposed property and curtilage is too large to enable the property to be affordable in the future and comply with the scale of development density. In addition, the applicant needs a two-bedroom property, and the surface area proposed is excessive for this need. The development is therefore contrary to the requirements of policies TAI 15 and PCYFF 2 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026 and the Supplementary Planning Guidance: Affordable Housing which ensure development of an acceptable scale which would be affordable in future.**

3. **The development is tantamount to erecting a new house in open countryside without any justification, and is contrary to the requirements of policies PCYFF 1 and paragraph 6.4.36 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026 and Technical Advice Note 6: Planning for sustainable rural communities.**

5.3 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0257/03/LL Tanygrisiau Car Park

Change of use of existing car park to a bus depot

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

a) The Planning Manager highlighted that a request had come to hand from the applicant to defer the decision.

In response to a question as to why the application was being deferred (Committee meeting 21/06/21 had been postponed) it was noted that the applicant wanted to review the observations from a public consultation on the proposal as well as consider the need for the future.

b) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application.

RESOLVED to defer the application.

Reasons:

1. **Need more time to review observations received during the consultation.**
2. **The suitability of the current location needs to be reviewed again as an electric bus will not be operated on the T19 service between Blaenau Ffestiniog and Llandudno.**

5.4 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0979/11/AC Land off Pen y Ffridd Road, Pen y Ffridd Road, Penrhosgarnedd, Bangor

Discharge and variation of condition 2 (minor external and internal amendments to some of the dwellings together with the erection of an additional privacy fence) of appeal consent APP/Q6810/A/20/3264389.

a) The Senior Development Control Officer highlighted that this was a planning application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to vary condition number 2 of appeal permission APP/Q681/A/20/3264389 to erect 30 houses on the Pen y Ffridd site in Bangor. The application was submitted to Committee as the size of the site exceeded 0.5ha in surface area and involved undertaking the following changes:

- Erecting a hit and miss timber fence, 1.8m high, between the side gardens of plots nos. 26 and 27 and the rears of nos. 1 and 2 Pen y Ffridd cottages to ensure privacy for cottage occupants.
- Replace a flat roof with a slate roof on the front porch of houses on plot nos. 23 to 26; 27 to 30; 5 to 14 and 21 to 22.

It was explained that the principle of developing the site for residential development had already been accepted by the Planning Inspectorate back in April 2021 and, therefore, any consideration of this latest application would be limited to the effect of the proposal on the visual amenities and residential amenities of neighbouring occupants. The proposal involved replacing flat roofs for the front porches of 20 houses with natural slate roofs to be in keeping with the main roofs. Given the requirements of Policy PCYFF 3 which stated that developments were expected to display a high-quality design, it was believed in this case that the proposal to replace flat roofs in prominent places on the front of houses was an improvement compared to that approved previously for flat roofs.

It was also noted that erecting a timber fence, 1.8m high, would be acceptable between the side gardens of plots nos. 26 and 27 and the rears of nos. 1 and 2 Pen y Ffridd cottages on grounds of the effect on the visual amenities. The fence would ensure the privacy of the occupants of these cottages and, at the same time, comply with a condition included in the decision of the Planning Inspectorate in relation to introducing boundary treatment details. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable on grounds of protecting the visual amenities of the local area and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupants.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following observations:
   - Proposed amendments to the plans were not significant - they related to minor amendments to the plan only.
   - The proposed amendments related to the replacement of the flat porch roof with a slate roof, as well as minor amendments to the internal layout of affordable housing type 4P2B and 5P3B and private property type 5P3B. The proposed changes would improve the appearance of the property.
   - The minor improvements appeared on a revised site plan.
   - Proposed revisions to the Boundary Treatment Plan involved erecting a hit and miss timber fence, 1.8m high, on the boundary between Pen y Ffridd cottages (nos. 1 and 2) and plots 26 and 27. This would ensure privacy for the occupants of the cottages.
   - The proposed changes complied with local and national planning policy and should therefore be approved.

c) A proposal was made to approve the application and it was seconded.

RESOLVED to delegate the right to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to the following condition: -

The amendment/s hereby permitted shall be carried out in strict conformity with the details submitted to the Local Planning Authority, and contained in the form of application and in any other documents accompanying such application unless condition(s) to amend them is/are included on this planning decision notice. Notwithstanding the amendments hereby permitted, the remainder of the development must be completed in strict conformity with the details and conditions included in planning permission number C19/1072/11/LL.

5.5 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0668/43/LL Land near Uwch y Don, Bwlch Gwynt, Pistyll, Pwllheli

Construction of affordable dwelling

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application to construct an affordable home (four bedrooms) on land above Uwch y Don, Pistyll. The site was served by a steep unclassified county road which led from the centre of the village that was located within the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. The land had been designated as the Dolydd Pistyll Local Wildlife Site.

The application was submitted to the planning committee at the Local Member's request.

Pistyll was designated as a Cluster village in the Gwynedd and Anglesey Local Development Plan, therefore, the relevant housing policy in this case was Policy TAI 6 Houses in Clusters. It was highlighted that only affordable homes could be approved in cluster villages and on suitable sites located adjacent to buildings that were coloured red on the Inset Maps and subject to complying with all of the policy's criteria.

It was highlighted that the proposal did comply with criteria 2, 3 and 4 of the policy, however in relation to criterion 1, whilst there was no doubt that the applicant complied in terms of being a local person, they had to consider whether the applicant was in genuine need of an affordable home as they already owned a house. No evidence had been received to demonstrate that it was not possible to extend the existing house to meet their needs and it was not clear as to how much equity would be released in selling the current house. Consequently, Tai Teg was not in a situation to assess whether the applicant had a genuine need for an affordable home. New housing in the countryside could only be approved as an exception to policy, as the last possible resort, and there had to be no doubt that the affordable element was valid. Whilst appreciating the applicant's situation, based on the information to hand, the application did not meet the requirements of criterion 1 of the policy.

After the agenda had been published, an inconsistency in the scale of the printed plans were highlighted and amended plans had been received on 6/12/21. A four-bedroom, 6-person house was expected to have approximately 110m of internal floor space. The amended plans showed an internal floor area of 115m and it could be accepted that the applicant did require additional space for a home office. There was no longer any objection to the size of the house, however some concern remained on the size of the plot and the value of the property as no open market valuation had been submitted. Therefore, the proposal did not comply with criteria 5, 6 and 7 of the policy.

Additionally, a lack of information regarding the impact of the proposal on the amenities of nearby residents and the wildlife site was highlighted, however as the proposal did not comply with some of the criteria, the applicant had not been asked to incur costs in providing such information.

Having considered the proposal against the relevant policies it was considered that the proposal was unacceptable due to lack of evidence of an affordable property and concern about the size and value of the plot. It was reiterated that the proposal did not seek to retain the site's natural features in the best way possible for such a rural

location and they had not received a wildlife assessment. It was suitable for a cluster village; however, it did not meet every criterion under Policy TAI6.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following observations:
- That he currently lived in a former council house in Nefyn.
- He lived in a council street and suffered antisocial behaviour from neighbours who swore and shouted obscene things at him and his family when they spent time in the garden or as they approached their car.
- He felt afraid in his own property with loud noises on the street at times, which affected the sleep patterns and development of his three-year-old son. The concerns had been referred to Adra and to the Police on more than one occasion. The situation was affecting their other nine-year-old son who suffered from a condition where he made himself sick if there was any disturbance.
- He was deeply concerned about his children's mental health and wished to leave the street but also remain within the area to avoid any negative impact on the children by having to change schools.
- Originally from Pistyll, he was eager for the right to live at home and contribute to his own locality and provide his children with a happy life, which was what he had experienced.
- His family had lived there for five generations - his parents were farming the land and his father, who was now approaching retirement age needed more support on the farm and was suffering from the effects of knee surgery. As the only son, he felt that it was his duty to continue with the family tradition.
- If he were forced to sell it would not be possible to stay in the local area as they were priced out of the housing market (suitable four-bedroom houses in Nefyn were in excess of £400,000 and there were no houses to rent in the area). This price was not realistic for a single person salary - his partner was studying a Mental Health course and was therefore not earning wages.
- He relied on his mother to provide childcare - back-up support in Pistyll.
- Tai Teg had said that the only way to address the criterion was to make his family homeless but that did not provide them with security.
- That his current house was bound by a section 157 agreement and he was therefore in discussions with Gwynedd Council to sell the house back to them.
- Approving the development would free up two houses for local people in the area and would help to revive Pistyll which was quickly turning into a holiday village.
- He implored the Committee to give a local family that was more than willing to compromise the right to live at home.

c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:
- That the application in question was unique.
- That the applicant lived in a former Council house in Nefyn but antisocial behaviour issues in the street were having a substantial impact on him and his family and they wished to return to Pistyll, the village where he was born.
- The applicant had been offered a plot of land by his father to build a house for the family - and this would also enable him to help out on the farm.
- A 157 condition on the applicant's current house restricted the sale to people from Gwynedd. The applicant had contacted the Council’s Housing and Property Department to enquire whether they would be interested in buying back the house - this would mean affordable homes available for two families.
- Tai Teg's advice was for the family to make themselves homeless!
- A number of the aspects complied with the criteria of Policy TAI 6 and the applicant was prepared to compromise further with the requirements

- Their hope was to create a forever home - not a palatial second home, but an affordable home for a local family
- A number supported the application - no objections - letters had been submitted in support of the application
- The vision of Gwynedd's Housing Strategy was to support everyone in Gwynedd to prosper and to live full lives in their communities and improve quality of life - this was an opportunity to do this - the family met the requirements, and so why refuse them? It was a deserving application.
- Requested the Committee to use its wisdom and protect the residents of Gwynedd.

ch) A proposal was made to approve the application and it was seconded.

d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:

- The application was an unusual one - the size was acceptable but there was a need to ensure consistency with affordable homes requirements
- The applicant was from Pistyll and was very active in his community - a golden opportunity here to show support for a local family
- The proposal would blend in well in the area and with the nearby cottages
- No local objection - the Community Council had pleaded with the Committee to approve the application
- The AONB Unit had referred to the house as one of a relatively simple design
- That a number of significant points had been included in the public consultations
- Gwynedd Housing Strategy's chief mantra was to provide housing for local people
- The location and size of the house were suitable - the only objection was the need to evidence that the applicant was eligible
- The 157 Agreement on the applicant's property would free up the house in Nefyn - this was a solution to the problems in rural areas.
- There was enough evidence here to approve - the applicant's property would not be sold on the open market - it would be restricted to Gwynedd residents only - it was assumed that its value would not be high
- People needed support to buy locally and to stay in their communities

In response to the observations the Assistant Head of Department noted that although he sympathised with the applicant, suffering antisocial behaviour was not evidence that the applicant was eligible for an affordable house. He noted that no evidence had been received to demonstrate that it was not possible to extend the existing house to meet their needs and it was not clear as to how much equity would be released in selling the current house. Consequently, Tai Teg was not in a situation to assess whether the applicant had a genuine need for an affordable home. Whilst appreciating the applicant's situation, based on the information to hand, the application did not meet the requirements of criterion 1 of policy TAI 6.

dd) Proposed and seconded - an amendment to defer the application to obtain more information

RESOLVED: To defer - a request for the applicant to submit more information and evidence that he is eligible for an affordable home

5.6 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0835/19/LL Llain Meddygon, Caeathro, Caernarfon, Gwynedd

Erection of replacement buildings (partially retrospective) for use as a commercial workshop, store and garage, and for retrospective consent for the formation of new entrance and access road and also for the demolition of a garage and shed

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a partly retrospective application for the construction of an industrial workshop (class use B2) on the location of a previous agricultural building. It was reported that the new workshop would measure 20 metres long, 12 metres wide and 5.2 metres to the ridge and would be of a steel framework construction (already in place) covered with steel sheets and the nearest residential homes were located approximately 200 metres from the site.

The workshop would be used for the applicant's business. It was reiterated that it was intended to erect a domestic garage on the site of a former garage and retain the new access to the adjacent unclassified county road.

The principle of the proposal had been assessed according to Policy CYF 6 of the Plan where it was noted that proposals for building for new employment/business could be approved provided they complied with the policy's criteria. It was noted that the Policy encouraged small-scale developments that made appropriate use of existing buildings that were in-keeping with the rural areas. Nevertheless, the current Policy did not define the scale, therefore the case needed to be considered in relation to the purpose and objectives of the Policy and it was difficult to see how a B2 use class industrial building of this size would comply with this Policy.

It was explained that the applicant ran his business from the Peblig Industrial Estate in Caernarfon but that the site was too small for the business' activities and therefore the applicant intended extend his business to another property in Penygroes. This arrangement would allow company staff to work from the units at Penygroes Industrial Estate and the applicant to work from home for personal reasons. It was also noted that the applicant would not need to work within existing industrial units due to the nature of his work within the business and it therefore appeared that the intention was to establish the business in Llain Meddygon due to personal needs. It was therefore considered that it had not been demonstrated that the countryside location of the business was crucial for the business and that it could be managed from another location and that no planning justification had been provided for approving the workshop on a site outside the development boundary.

It was not considered that the size, scale and nature of the proposal complied with the objectives of policies PCYFF1, PCYFF2, PCYFF3 and CYF6 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan and therefore the recommendation was to refuse the application.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following observations:

- He was the owner of Axis Precision which employed and trained local people - employed eight staff members and seven of these were Welsh-speakers.
- The business was currently based on Peblig estate but was about to move to the Penygroes estate as the roof was leaking and the plant was rusting - it was not a good place to work, it was cold and damp.
- His wife suffered from MS and the illness was having a major impact on his children who had been caring for her since they were young children while

he was working. Although unhappy with the situation, his wife understood that he had to dedicate his time to the business at that time.

- They had purchased Llain Meddygon as they saw an opportunity for him to run the business from home and care for his wife - this was important to him as it was not fair to burden the children with the responsibility as they now needed to concentrate on their own lives.
- Work had been done to the house in Llain Meddygon to make it suitable for a disabled person - the hope was to move in during the spring months.
- The original outdoor buildings were not in a good condition and therefore he had decided to buy a new shed. He had received poor advice on planning applications and regretted this.
- Should the application be refused, it was more than likely that jobs would be lost and the business could potentially close down.

c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following points:

- He supported the application and accepted that it was an unusual application
- The intention was to facilitate the applicant's living and working patterns and provide the opportunity for him and his son to work from home and care for his wife
- Confirmed that the business was moving from Peblig to Penygroes - it would not be operating on two sites
- The framework of the development was already in place and was similar to the original shed and although it was possibly longer, the ridge was 1m lower. Accepted that the applicant had begun the work but this was because he had been misled
- The shed would be painted green which was similar to adjacent buildings and would blend in with the environment - it was not detrimental - of a better standard than the original building
- The LDP favoured supporting businesses such as this one
- The Bontnewydd Community Council had discussed the application in detail - no objection other than what the building would entail - it was now understood there would be a shed and a garage - the building was not solely for the business
- It was proposed to plant trees and carry out landscaping and create a new safer access
- Larger units could be seen in rural areas
- This was an opportunity to support local Welsh people

d) It was proposed and seconded to defer the application.

e) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:

- That the proposal appeared to be an improvement on the previous building
- Needed a better assessment of the impact given that the building was smaller than the previous one
- That an explanation had been received for the access
- The proposal was to offer work and opportunities locally
- Why the need to maintain sites in Penygroes and Bontnewydd?

In response to an observation on the access and the curtilage, the Planning Manager noted that the Officers did not have any concerns regarding parking and the size of the curtilage as it was intended that only two people would be working

in the building. Compliance with policy CYF6 was the matter of greatest concern to officers.

RESOLVED to defer.

Request for a more detailed assessment of the visual impact and an answer to the question, why were work sites needed in Penygroes and Bontnewydd?

5.7 APPLICATION NUMBER C20/0669/11/LL Blenheim House, Holyhead Road, Bangor, Gwynedd

Application to demolish existing buildings and erect a 4-storey building to create 36 residential units, associated vehicular parking spaces, amendments to the existing vehicular access and creation of new vehicular access

a) The Senior Development Control Officer highlighted that this was a full application to develop a site adjacent to Holyhead Road and Convent Lane within the Bangor development boundary as contained in the LDP - it had not been designated or protected for any particular use. The principle of developing the site against Policy PCYFF 1 and Policy TAI 1 of the LDP was considered.

It was explained that the indicative housing supply level for Bangor during the Plan period was 969 units and in April 2021, the windfall land bank stood at 118 units, with further permission for 70 units on sites already designated for housing in the LDP. In such circumstances, consideration would be given to the units that had been completed thus far within the Key Centres tier with Policy PS 17 of the LDP noting that 53% of the housing growth would be located within the Key Centres. According to a survey of the situation in relation to the provision within all the Key Centres in April 2021, it appeared that 1,647 units from the total of 4,194 units had been completed, and that 943 were in the land bank (and likely to be completed). Considering the current situation, support could be given to approve this site against general provision (based on the completion rate so far) within the Key Centres category; however, in light of the position of windfall sites in Bangor, any justification submitted with this application should be reviewed outlining how the proposal would address the needs of the local community.

In response to this requirement, the applicant had submitted a Housing Impact Assessment along with background information. In response to the information, the Local Planning Authority noted the following:

- While the Tai Teg Register highlighted the need for intermediate housing, the need for flats was fairly low, and in particular one-bedroom flats - 3% for one-bedroom flats and 7% for two-bedroom flats).
- There was no specific evidence from local estate agents about any waiting lists.
- The Assessment did not refer to the former Jewsons site (permission for 77 one and two-bedroom open market flats including 13 intermediate affordable flats).
- It must therefore be considered whether the evidence submitted by the applicant for a general need for smaller sized units was sufficient to justify granting permission for 36 additional flats in Bangor, which would mean increasing the land-bank of flats from 178 to 214 for Bangor.

In response to the above observations, additional information was submitted by the applicant stating: -

- Local estate agents were in a much more knowledgeable position than the Council in relation to assessing the commercial need for residential units in Bangor.
- As the applicant was in the business of constructing and selling houses, it would not make sense to build units where there was not much need for them.
- The Housing Impact Assessment clearly showed that there was a need for social and intermediate one and two-bedroom units in Bangor.
- It was impossible for the applicant to confirm, with certainty, the construction time of residential developments in Bangor that was beyond their control. Although the applicant was interested in the former Jewsons site, the site could not be developed at present for 77 flats as an application to discharge a condition regarding affordable home details had been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. Should the Jewsons development (C17/0835/11/MG for 70 flats) not proceed (as it was not guaranteed that this permission would be granted), there would be a reduction of 34 units within the residential unit bank permitted (including the Llys Ioan site).
- Approving more one and two-bedroom units in Bangor would have a positive impact on affordability.
- It was considered that developing this prominent and unimposing site (which was also a brownfield site) in a sustainable location within the city would be material consideration of such a scale that it would outweigh any policy concerns/conflict.

It was argued that the key issue here was that the proposal, cumulatively with the current land bank and housing designations to develop housing in the city, involved a level of development that would be above the indicative demand for residential units during the LDP period. Therefore, the Local Planning Authority would have to be convinced that this proposal would help to meet the needs of the local community. Despite this, having assessed all information, the Local Planning Authority had not been undoubtedly convinced that the applicant had justified the provision of 36 residential units in the form of one and two-bedroom flats, which was in addition to the 177 flats that were already within the land bank in Bangor. As a result, the proposal did not meet the needs of the local community in accordance with Policy TAI8.

In the context of visual amenities, the scale, design, setting and landscaping was considered and it was concluded that the proposal was acceptable on the basis of the impact of visual amenities of this part of the streetscape.

In the context of general and residential matters, it was highlighted that residential dwellings were located to the north, east and west of the site and a number of objections had been received following a statutory public consultation relating to noise disturbance, light pollution, air pollution, litter and creation of an oppressive structure. Nevertheless, due to the urban nature of the site it was considered that noise nuisance or pollution/litter that may derive from this proposed development would not be any different in nature to any other type of development situated in a residential area.

A concern had also been submitted regarding the oppressive impact of the building on the amenities of local residents although the proposed building had been designed in order to reduce its impact and physical impact within the local streetscape. Having considered the land levels, the layout of the residential dwellings in relation to the proposed building, along with the space between them,

it was considered that the building itself would not create a substantial mask or oppressive structure at the expense of the general amenities of the occupants of these dwellings as the building was designed to reduce any substantial direct overlooking.

In the context of transport and access matters, a Transport Statement had been submitted with the application, which concluded that transport levels that may derive from the development could be acceptable on the grounds of road safety along with the safety of road users. In response to the statutory consultation process, the Transportation Unit had no objection to the application based on road safety and accessibility of the site, subject to the inclusion of relevant conditions/notes.

A Welsh Language Statement had been submitted with the application in accordance with the requirements of Policy PS1 of the LDP, along with advice included in the SPG: Maintaining and Creating Unique and Sustainable Communities.

As the proposal provided 7 affordable units, it was noted that this would comply with the requirements of Policy TAI 15 of the LDP regarding the thresholds of affordable housing and their distribution. It was reiterated that the applicant had received a valuation for the intermediate affordable units from two qualified local estate agents and a 20% discount would be needed for the valuation for the one-bedroom units and a 30% discount for the valuation for the two-bedroom units to make them affordable on an intermediate level.

It was considered that the proposal to develop 36 residential units on this site would not be acceptable in principle based on a lack of evidence that there was a real need in Bangor for small one and two-bedroom units in addition to the 177 similar units/flats that were already within the land bank for the city. Approving the application would lead to an imbalance in this type of residential accommodation provision in Bangor and it would not respond positively to housing needs that had been identified in the city and, therefore, it was considered unacceptable.

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

- That site was a derelict landmark which stood prominently adjacent to the railway station. It had a negative impact on the setting of this part of the City. It did not create a great first impression for visitors arriving at the station.
- The proposal would totally transform the site and its location and make a positive contribution towards the regeneration of the City.
- The Officers had no problem with the design of the building and they agreed that it was tantamount to a high-quality redevelopment on a brownfield site in a sustainable location.
- The only concern related to a hypothetical housing supply matter. Considering other permissions for residential developments in Bangor, officers were of the opinion that this plan would lead to an oversupply of housing provided by windfall sites. The concern derived from housing targets that had been calculated many years ago. By now, significant events such as Brexit and Covid had had a substantial impact on the way of life and where to live. On this basis, it was suggested that the calculation was dated and that it was now completely irrelevant.
- There was no certainty that all permissions would be implemented. Officers had asked for an evaluation of extant planning permissions and the likelihood that they would be delivered. This was not possible as the

intention of landowners and independent developers could not be anticipated or they may be unwilling to disclose this information accurately.

- His clients owned the former Jewsons site in the City, which had an extant planning permission but for 70 flats. Unlikely that the site would be developed in accordance with the current permission as the latest market research showed that a mix of town houses and flats would be more suitable for it. Such a mix would halve the number of housing units that were intended to be developed.
- The former Jewsons site was a very different site to the location of the application in question, which was ideal to develop flats. Should the Jewsons site permission be resubmitted and the application in question was approved, there would be no net increase in the number of units in the land bank. There was no certainty either that the other permissions that contributed towards the land bank would be implemented.
- A concern was often raised regarding housing affordability in Bangor - the price was set by need and supply. Preventing developments like this would worsen the gap between the need and the supply, and further increase prices.
- Officers of the opinion that this was a high-quality plan and had been well considered. The construction phase would provide a huge boost for local traders and the supply chain. In the long-term, the occupants of the flats would be likely to spend some of their income in the City, which would be welcomed.
- Benefits of the plan would outweigh any hypothetical oversupply matters and granting permission was encouraged.
- What was the future of this landmark site if a well-designed housing development was not deemed acceptable? Should the site continue to be derelict, what would this say about the Council's regeneration ambitions?

c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, Councillor Catrin Wager noted the following observations: The observations of a fellow Local Member, Councillor Mair Rowlands were also presented.

Councillor Mair Rowlands

- Following discussions, local people objected to the application. Although supportive of the proposal to try to meet local housing needs and to develop affordable units, there were different reasons for objecting to this development.
- The proposed building was out of character - not only within the local streetscape but also within the city. The design was not in-keeping with the area, especially given that this was an important strategic site, overlooking the railway station. The four-storey building would dominate and invade all of the land available on the site and it was excessive in terms of scale and height. The concept and design were unsympathetic to the character of Bangor as an ancient and historic city.
- Concerns had been raised about traffic and road safety - it was considered that the proposal would increase traffic along a single road at the expense of pedestrian safety, including school children and college students, which was also a cycle path within the city.
- An over-development of this type of units without evidence of the need for more flats in Bangor. The right amount of housing developments and flats had recently been approved and developed in Bangor, which included the Plas Farrar Adra development - one and two-bedroom flats in Bangor that would be adjacent to this proposed development.

- The applicants cannot justify the need to provide 36 residential units in the form of one and two-bedroom flats, which was in addition to the 177 flats that were already within the land bank in Bangor and, therefore, it was not believed that the proposal satisfied the needs of the local community in accordance with Policy TAI8.
- Approving this application would mean that the supply would exceed the Bangor indicative growth level, which would lead to an imbalance in this type of residential accommodation provision in Bangor. It would not respond positively to housing needs in Bangor.

Councillor Catrin Wager

- Supported the recommendation - the development did not meet the local need.
- Bangor City Council and the Civic Society had noted objections although the observations had not been included in the report.
- Disagreed with the statement that 'the proposal is acceptable on the basis of the impact of visual amenities' - the 3m development was above the road and four-storeys - it would appear oppressive and excessive.
- The site was strategically important for Bangor - a site that needed to be developed and part of Bangor's regeneration plans.
- The design was not in-keeping with historic buildings of the railway.
- The railway building was registered - should this building be registered as well? Did not want to lose the historical connection - needed to protect the heritage of the City.
- The area offered buildings that were in-keeping with special features - needed to preserve this.
- The site was empty and problematic - needed to get it back into use but this was not the right development for this site.

d) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

e) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:

- The development would have a substantial impact on the streetscape.
- Needed to protect a historic building.
- Needed a better design for the site - this design was oppressive in a prominent site.
- No justification for the need - the Jewsons development had not proceeded, why? No demand for this type of flats?
- Alien plans
- Hundreds of flats had been constructed in Bangor - no need for more
- A shame to turn down such an investment but it was the wrong development in the wrong place
- Additional basis for refusal suggested in terms of visual impact - scale and density.

In response to a suggestion on an additional basis for refusal, the need for the proposer to support the suggestion was made should the application go to appeal. Councillor Stephen Churchman accepted the advice and he agreed for the additional basis for refusal to be submitted.

RESOLVED to delegate the right to the Senior Planning Manager to refuse the application based on the following reasons:

1. **The proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policies PS 17 and TAI 1 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan (2017) as the applicant has not submitted sufficient evidence with the application to convince the Local Planning Authority that there is a need for additional one and two-bedroom flats in Bangor, bearing in mind that this proposal exceeds the indicative housing growth level of Bangor for windfall sites. As a result, the proposal is also contrary to criteria 2, 3, 4 and 5 of Policy TAI 8 of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (2017) as it is believed that it would create an imbalance in the type and mix of small units within the city, and no evidence has been received that the proposal responds positively to the needs of the local community.**

2. **The proposal is contrary to PCYFF 3 and 4 - impact on visual amenities - scale, density, impact on the street scene - an oppressive building.**

5.8 APPLICATION NUMBER Item C21/0569/35/AC George IV Hotel, 23 - 25 High Street, Criccieth, Gwynedd

Removal of condition 4 on permission C16/0292/35/LL limiting occupation of the units (apart from warden and staff accommodation) to people over 55 years of age only or those who form an individual home with such a person

APPLICATION HAD BEEN WITHDRAWN

5.9 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0411/46/LL Land at Tyddyn Du, Dinas, Pwllheli, LL53 8SU

Erection of building to keep agricultural equipment and feed including two stables and a tack store.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

The Local Member highlighted his wish for the Committee to defer the application so that it would be possible for officers to assess additional information that had been submitted by the applicant.

RESOLVED: To defer the decision in accordance with the request of the Local Member in order to assess additional information.

5.10 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0768/42/LL Tyn y Cae Caravan Park, Tai Lôn, Nefyn, Pwllheli

Extension of caravan park to adjoining field with the addition of 8 Static Caravan Plots, increasing the total number of pitches from 17 Static Caravans to 25.

a) The Enforcement Officer highlighted that the application sought to extend an existing static caravan park in an adjacent agricultural field, increasing the number of static caravans on the site from 17 to 25. It was explained that the main policy relating to static caravan sites was Policy TWR 3 of the LDP "Static Caravan, Chalet and Permanent Alternative Camping Accommodation Sites" with Part 4 of the policy stating that proposals to improve existing static caravan and chalet sites had to comply with relevant criteria.

It was noted that the proposal did not submit improvements to the park and landscaping plans had not been submitted. It was reiterated that the site was in a prominent visual

location and that there would be a cumulative impact on the landscape as a result of allowing more plots for static caravans in the location. Natural Resources Wales expressed concern regarding the visual impact of the plan, particularly when considering its proximity to the AONB boundary.

It was not considered that the development would be acceptable as it was contrary to the criteria of policy TWR 3 and the development would also be detrimental to the rural landscape adjacent to the AONB (contrary to the requirements of policies PCYFF 2, PCYFF 3, PCYFF 4 and AMG 1 of the LDP).

b) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

RESOLVED: To refuse

It is not considered that the extension to the caravan site would be small in terms of the site area or the number of caravans, nor would there be any improvements to the existing site as part of the plan and the site extension would cause visual harm to the landscape, in a location adjacent to the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. For these reasons the application is contrary to Criteria I, III, IV, V and VII of Part 4 of Policy TWR 3 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026, together with policies PCYFF 2, PCYFF 3, PCYFF 4 and AMG 1 as they relate to protecting the quality of the rural landscape in a location close to the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty boundary.

The meeting commenced at 10:00 and concluded at 13:20

CHAIR