

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 27 April 2026

---

Chair: Councillor Elwyn Edwards  
Vice-chair: Councillor Huw Rowlands

### **Councillors:**

Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Elin Hywel, Berwyn Parry Jones, Gareth T Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Cai Larsen, Gareth Coj Parry, Edgar Owen, Gareth Anthony Roberts, John Pughe Roberts and Gruffydd Williams

**Local Members:** Councillors John Pughe, Elin Walker Jones and Rhys Tudur

**Officers:** Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Services - Monitoring Officer), Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Environment), Gwawr Hughes (Planning Manager), Elan Mared Lloyd (Planning Officer), and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

### **1. APOLOGIES**

Apologies were received from Councillor Dafydd Meurig.

Councillor Gareth Coj Parry lost connection during item 5.1 and was unable to rejoin the meeting.

Councillor Louise Hughes was welcomed back to the Committee after a period of ill-health.

### **2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS**

- a) The following Members declared that they were Local Members in relation to the items noted:

Councillor John Pughe (Morfa Tywyn ward - not a Member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 C25/0403/09/CR on the agenda

Councillor Elin Walker Jones (not a Member of this Planning Committee) in relation to items 5.2 C25/0705/11/LL and 5.3 C25/0706/11/LL on the agenda

Councillor Rhys Tudur (not a Member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 C25/0710/41/LL on the agenda

Although the name of Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones (a Member of this Planning Committee), appeared as the Local Member in relation to application 5.1 on the agenda, the Monitoring Officer confirmed that the Corbett Arms Hotel (C25/0403/09/CR) was not within the Councillor's ward (West Tywyn), however, she was permitted to take part in the discussion.

### **3. URGENT ITEMS**

As a point of order, it was reported that since the Chair was joining the meeting virtually, the Monitoring Officer would be announcing the results of the voting on the applications.

### **4. MINUTES**

The Chair accepted the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee held on 23 March 2026, 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.

### 5.1 APPLICATION NUMBER: C25/0403/09/CR Corbett Arms Hotel, Corbett Square, Tywyn, Gwynedd, LL36 9DG

**Application for listed building consent [LBC] for the phased deconstruction and partial demolition of the building, and the maintenance works required to stabilise the remaining structure**

- a) The Planning Manager, having received more information, highlighted that the total demolition work had reduced and that it was now only relevant to the rear part of the building.

It was explained that the building was a former hotel, that was grade II listed, and within the Tywyn development boundary, it was a significant structure that faced Corbett Square, with a gable-end facing Maengwyn Street with further additions to the rear and the left side of the building. It was also noted that a nearby residential property and the building's gable-end were on Maengwyn Street. It was considered that the building was at risk in accordance with the Listed Buildings at Risk register, kept by Cadw.

The use of the building as a hotel came to an end around 2009, and there had been barely any maintenance on the building over the following years. The building was now becoming derelict, with parts of the rear of the building having collapsed in January and February 2025.

A structural survey report, demolition and deconstruction methodology and a Heritage Impact Assessment were submitted with the application. Reference was made to the footprint of the whole building that had been divided into 8 zones to refer to them easier. It was reported that there was an intention to demolish zones 1-5 based on the building's structural stability due to health and safety reasons following a recent collapse, with zones 2 and 4 being areas that fell in January and February 2025.

It was noted that the amended proposal requested listed building consent to demolish Zones 1, 2, 4 and part of Zone 5 (noted as 5A), as well as associated work to stabilise the remaining structure and secure it from the weather. It was reiterated that the existing plan represented a significant reduction in the scale of the demolition work that was originally intended, following responses to the consultation and submitting more structural information.

It was highlighted, when determining the application, there was a need to carefully consider whether it would be desirable to protect the listed building, its location and any features of special architectural or historic interest associated with the building, in accordance with section 96(2) of Historic Environment (Wales) Act 2023. It was reiterated that preserving a building or historic asset did not mean that it had to be maintained unchanged, but that its significance was sustained for the future; the statutory duty had received considerable importance and weight when reaching the recommendation.

It was expressed that the proposed work would lead to losing a historic fabric within the zones noted, causing damage to the significance of the listed building. However, Members were reminded that Zones 2 and 4 had already partially collapsed, that Zone 1 included a modern conservatory of negligible heritage value, and Zone 5A had been structurally compromised and directly associated with the collapsed areas. The proposal would retain the principal elevations and the majority of the historic fabric which defined the building's character and significance, and the damage deriving from the proposals were assessed as less than significant.

A national policy demands that the demolition of a listed building should be something extreme, and the decision was supported by a clear and convincing justification; made only as the last resort. The application was supported by structural review information, evidence of the recent collapses in January and February 2025, and ongoing concerns regarding structural instability and risks to public safety (especially given the location of the building adjacent to a highway). It was reiterated that monitoring data and subsequent reassessment had informed a revised approach which significantly reduced the extent of demolition and focused only on those areas that had already collapsed or were demonstrably unstable.

It was reported that the Authority had carefully considered whether the building could be stabilised and repaired without demolition, or whether less intervention would be sufficient. Although consultants had raised concerns regarding the adequacy of the evidence base and questioned whether the alternative options had been considered sufficiently, it was considered that the amended proposal reflected a more commensurate response that would target those elements where it was not possible to retain them without unacceptable risk. On this basis, it was concluded that the proposed work represented the minimum necessary intervention to secure the building and the "last resort" test had been satisfied.

The proposed work would provide clear and significant public benefits, and, in this case, it was considered that the benefits of stabilising the building, addressing safety concerns immediately by ensuring the retention of the building's main historic fabric in the long-term outweighed the damage that derived from losing impacted areas. It was reiterated, as a relevant consideration, that without intervention, a further collapse and deterioration would likely occur, leading to more significant harm, including the loss of the entire building.

It was acknowledged that the front porch had been removed without listed building consent and it was highlighted that there was consideration to this unauthorised work in the assessment; it would be necessary to impose a condition requiring details to restore the porch and the associated features to address the damage.

The officers considered that the proposal complied with the local and national planning policy and recommended approving the application with conditions.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:

- He was a Chartered Structural Engineer, a full member of the Institute of Historic Building Conservation (IHBC) and the Conservation Accreditation Register for Engineers (CARE). He was a member of the National Trust's expert advisory panel, a consulting engineers director for the Mann Williams company and he had over 30 years of experience of assessing, caring for and repairing historic buildings.
- He had provided structural conservation advice to SAVE Britains Heritage in relation to the Corbett Arms, and that he spoke on behalf of SAVE.
- He had worked on many listed buildings in different repair conditions and fully acknowledged the challenges facing the Corbett Arms. The challenges were not unusual and they could be addressed. The building could be saved and secured.

- Although SAVE supported the proposed proposal with conditions, they felt that the conditions were open to interpretation, and therefore a more comprehensive explanation was required to ensure that the conditions were robust and sufficient.
- Attention was drawn to the condition that noted that a professional should be employed who was qualified in conservation to submit and agree a detailed methodology and gradual plan of the demolition work, to include details to secure and protect the building prior to commencing the work.  
He noted that professional bodies had qualifications and accreditation schemes that focused on historic building work. For engineers, the qualification was CARE, which was administered by IStructE, ICE and Engineers Ireland. It was suggested that the existing consultants in this case had 'equivalent' experience - this remained to be a matter of controversial opinion. It was assumed that the condition made it a requirement for CARE registered engineers to be employed by the applicant to satisfy the detailed methodology requirements associated with engineering. The wording should be explained 'suitably' to avoid ambiguity, confusion or misunderstanding and it was essential to impose a condition that a CARE registered engineer was employed.
- He welcomed that the proposed conditions required detailed methodology and a gradual plan for the demolition work, and to submit and agree on details to secure and protect the building prior to commencing the work. The details should also include a plan to restore the porch and garden within the wall, as well as details of salvaging materials.
- However, he questioned how any methodology could be assessed for approval when the applicant continued to refuse access for independent scrutiny. Appropriate checks to the methodology should be checked to ensure that it was only the least necessary work that occurred.
- SAVE was trying to protect the Corbett Arms Hotel.
- There was support for the application for essential restricted dismantling based on a better explanation of the robust commitment from the applicant to repair and secure the building.
- Acting on behalf of SAVE, he had tried to engage constructively and productively with the Council's consultants, acknowledging that immediate action was required to secure the building.
- That applications to gain access to review the building had been refused time after time by the applicant and any suggestions proposed to the consultants had been refused. Refusing to engage or allow access ruled out reasonable scrutiny.
- He noted that the porch and garden within the wall had been removed without listed building consent and therefore, he welcomed that conditions required it to be fully restored. However, there was suspicion that removing these elements had been necessary, and no evidence was submitted to justify the unauthorised work.
- Providing the details of the restoration would be considered a reasonable condition to approve the existing application.

- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations;
- The building and the current situation of having scaffolding around the site created disturbance to the town's residents.
  - Traffic diversions on narrow roads created chaos in the town centre.
  - Local businesses, including the cinema and the laundrette, were losing revenue.
  - With falling debris, the property had to be secured, the cottages next door to the building had to be secured and the public had to be protected. The area of the site had to be made safe and avoid a situation that would go from bad to worse - this was the priority.
  - Although scaffolding had been up for 12 months, the town's residents understood that safety was essential.

- Had gained access to the building with the Police and the Fire Service, the damage was significant. Water damage had made some parts very unstable.
- The property's owner was unknown.
- The building was beautiful and iconic - the property was full of good memories
- There was a need for care during the demolition work - request for constant updates and photos.
- No probate, therefore who would pay for the reconstruction?

ch) The approval of the application was proposed and seconded

d) It was proposed and seconded to undertake a site visit.

The proposal was discussed, highlighting that visiting the site would be a valuable opportunity for all Members to see the impact that the building in its current form was having on the town's infrastructure and businesses, and to get a better explanation of the situation; what value would demolishing parts of the building have on the situation and what other possibilities could be considered.

In response to the proposal, the Assistant Head of Department noted that the details of the application were based on evidence from structural engineers and experts. He explained that the application was unusual, because a situation had arisen where the Council had to step in and take responsibility for the building to ensure the safety of the public. Despite accepting that the situation created disturbance in the town, this was because of an immediate response to health and safety matters. Should the application be approved, then it would be possible to move forward by revisiting and reassessing the situation.

In response to a question regarding the cost of scaffolding to taxpayers, it was noted that costs were not a planning consideration, but the Cabinet had approved funding from the Council's Financial Strategy Fund to fund the work of securing the building.

In response to an observation made by the objector that there was a 'lack of exploring alternative options' and there was a need for commitment to work with SAVE and tighten conditions to ensure the best action, it was noted that the views and observations from external bodies had been considered and the final proposal had been amended in relation to those observations. He elaborated that the Council did not own the building and the response was in accordance with a listed building statutory requirement.

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

- The safety of the people of Tywyn was the priority - the site must be made safe
- After demolition, the situation could be reassessed and consider the next steps
- Visiting the site and resubmitting an application would be a further delay to the process

e) A vote was taken on the proposal to carry out a site visit. The proposal fell.

In accordance with the procedure, the proposer and seconder who had recommended to approve the application were asked to confirm their proposal.

f) Confirmation was requested from the officers whether observations from Tywyn Town Council or Aberdyfi Town Council had been submitted 08-07-25 - it was confirmed that the ones submitted were Aberdyfi Town Council observations.

ff) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members;

- It was sad to see that part of the building was being demolished, especially part 5A
- There was a need to move forward - this would at least start the process.

**RESOLVED: To approve with conditions**

1. **5 years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Submit and agree a detailed methodology and a phased plan of the demolition works, to include details for securing and protecting the building prior to the commencement of the work. The details should also include a plan to restore the porch and garden along with details of salvaging materials.**
4. **A qualified conservation professional should be employed to supervise and agree the methodology and demolition work as they commence, and to have it agreed with the Local Planning Authority (LPA) before work commences.**
5. **The LPA should agree in writing on the details of the anchor bolts or pinning anchors before they are installed.**
6. **Completion of the Level 3 historic building record of the Corbett Arms Hotel. Subject to structural integrity with the building made safe and secure, a photographic record of the interior should be included in this record.**

**5.2 APPLICATION NUMBER C25/0706/11/CR Coleg Menai, Friars Building, Coleg Menai, Ffriddoedd Road, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2TS**

**Demolition of rear extensions and erection of a new two-storey extension along with landscaping works, erect a bicycle and bin storage building, and rearrange car park layout.**

Attention was drawn to the Late Observations Form (observations from the Land Drainage Unit).

- a) The Planning Officer highlighted that this was a full application with a proposal to demolish the two-storey rear section of the building and erect a new modern two-storey extension to enable teaching rooms to be brought up to modern standards. The new extension would be a mix of light grey / red brick and red aluminium cladding to include two large lecture halls, a general teaching room, toilets and seating areas, as well as corridors, stairs and external doors and a new lift. On the second floor of the extension, there will be space for the two lecture halls, as well as seating areas, toilets, equipment rooms and stores - all of these connecting to the main building. It was explained that internal restoration work within the main building was also part of the application, but the work did not require formal planning permission, but it had been assessed within the associated listed building application (C25/0706/11/CR). It was reiterated that a listed building assessment had been completed on the demolition work and the extensions' buildings.

It was reported that the building was very striking and significant, with an emphasis on its front elevation. There would be no change to the front elevation because the demolition work to the rear of the building would mean demolishing a significant extension from the 1930s; however, the demolition would mean that an extension could be erected that provided purposeful space to ensure long-term use of the building by Bangor University as part of their existing campus. It was noted that the landscaping work, re-arranging the parking provision and creating bicycle spaces also formed part of the application, with an intention to facilitate the connection by creating a new path to connect the University sites.

The site lies within the development boundary of the City of Bangor but outside the central area. It was highlighted that there were University sites near the site, as well as adjacent residential dwellings. The building was a grade II listed building.

Given the previous use of the site as a school and college, the relevant policy was Policy ISA 3 which noted that proposals were permitted for new facilities or extensions to existing buildings for academic or support purposes as long as there was consideration to the scale, location, design, amenity and transportation.

In terms of design matters, it was considered that the extension was designed around the existing features of the building which included use of the colour red around the windows; a modern contemporary design located to the rear of the main building as an ancillary extension. It was elaborated that the main building would continue to be the main focus, and with features such as the pitched roof on the extension suited the old building, it was considered that the design was acceptable and complied with policies PCYFF 2, PCYFF 3 and PS 10.

In the context of transportation and access matters, it was noted that a transportation statement had been submitted with the application, expressing that there was no intention to change or adapt the existing vehicular access, but to re-arrange the existing parking spaces within the site - the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal. It was reiterated, although public transport services often passed the site and there were paths for pedestrians and cyclists, however, it was considered that it would be reasonable to include a condition to agree to create a safe path for cyclists to improve the current situation. The proposal addressed the requirements of policies TRA 2 and TRA 4 of the Local Development Plan (LDP).

In the context of Biodiversity matters, the Biodiversity Unit had no objection to the proposal after they received and approved a plan showing the locations of the bat and bird nest boxes. However, concern was highlighted about the installation of two of the boxes at the front of the main building and although there was an agreement with the Biodiversity Unit to relocate them, it was considered that imposing a condition to agree the new location prior to their installation was acceptable. Reference was made to observations from Natural Resources Wales that agreed with this, but proposed relevant conditions to follow the appropriate measures.

In the context of Archaeological matters, reference was made to the Heneb observations which suggested, due to the demolition on the site, to impose a condition to ensure a suitable operating plan in advance. It was considered that this was reasonable and the proposal therefore complied with the requirements of policy PS20 of the LDP.

When discussing Drainage matters, it was noted that there was an initial proposal to connect the surface water to the main sewer, but it was highlighted that Welsh Water had noted that this was not acceptable. The Land Drainage Unit had confirmed that the developer had now submitted a SAB application for the development, but they were not in a situation to approve the application because further investigation was required. Having received new observations from the Land Drainage Unit (late observations form), which noted that it could not be assured that it was possible to deal with the surface water from the site in an acceptable way, and in accordance with the requirements of Technical Advice Note 15 without further information and approval of the SuDS Approval Body, the recommendation was amended.

Attention was drawn to the language statement submitted as part of the application with the Language Unit providing positive observations. It was considered that it would be appropriate to impose conditions to ensure that signs promoting the development were bilingual and therefore complied with policy PS 1 and the relevant SPG.

The Officers recommended to approve the application with conditions subject to receiving further information and positive observations from the Drainage Unit.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- She welcomed the idea of building the Albert Gubay Business School and wished Bangor University good luck with the venture. The University would certainly benefit, and it would also benefit Bangor. Excellent.
  - However, many concerns have been raised and therefore would like to see further conditions on the application as it was being approved.
  - Completely agree with the Land Drainage Unit's concerns - they needed to be addressed before moving forward.
  - She had consulted personally and arranged a specific meeting with her fellow ward councillors and University officers, where concern was expressed about traffic, water, ecological and environmental impacts, asbestos, disturbance to local residents and the deficiencies of the local consultation process. Although a meeting had been held at Pontio during the summer, it was considered that this was not sufficient as a local consultation, and there was a need to address the concerns of the Maestryfan community located adjacent to the site (a letter was sent to all Maestryfan residents following the meeting with the officers).
  - Drawing attention to a map of the site, it was noted that the plot of land adjacent to the former Ysgol Friars was a plot of land given to the people of Bangor, in a will from a local doctor. It was noted that there was a covenant on the land that nobody could build on it (the doctor was a strong believer that residents required green spaces). Until 2021, it was a piece of derelict land, where dogs were fouling and people used drugs. In 2021, the Maestryfan Community Group was established, and after receiving a grant, the community worked hard to create a beautiful, community garden out of land that was in tatters. Destroying the garden would destroy the heart of the community and therefore there was a need to ensure that all the construction, the dirt and the dust, would not impact the garden.
  - Although uncertain whether bats lived in the nearby trees, it was certain that birds nested in the trees and in the nest boxes around the garden, and therefore she did not want to see these being impacted.
  - The community's narrative had changed since creating the garden - from being a community that felt that everyone had forgotten about it, to being a positive, hopeful community, that was full of enthusiasm and care for each other. The garden was a symbol of the intense community work that had happened and was happening daily in the Maestryfan community; a symbol of the success of a community enterprise and the impacts of losing it would be far-reaching, and damaging to the community spirit.
  - Asbestos disposal - expected that the University would ensure that clearing the asbestos would not have a harmful impact on the nearby community.
  - She welcomed the assurance that there were no plans to develop the green field nearest to the construction.
  - Ffordd Ffriddoedd was a main road into Bangor city, a strategic civic corridor; that included specific bus routes in and out of the city. At peak hours, the road was used by over 2000 school pupils and their parents and the staff, who travel to and from two secondary schools, a primary school and an independent school - all of them a

stone's throw away from the development. When creating a Traffic Management Plan in and out of the site, the safety of children and adults, as pedestrians, cyclists and car drivers must be considered.

- There was an underground stream under Belmont Avenue that ran down towards the playing field next to the former Ysgol Friars. This must be considered when planning anything in the vicinity and any changes in the underground water flow, displacing water surface and flood risks because of disturbing the land.
- Attention was drawn to the fact that the Drainage Unit had refused the application until further investigations had been completed and the recommendation amended.
- It was asked about the specific impact on Coed Menai. Although observations had been noted about bats and birds, there were no observations about squirrels and barn owls. Consideration should also be given to these species.
- In principle, I believe that the development could be supported, but definite conditions were required on many matters. The Planning Committee was requested to delay the decision, to allow time to fully address the matters or impose tight conditions when approving - conditions that would consider public safety, detrimental impacts on ecology, the environment and the local community and nearby properties to;
  - Fully address the drainage department's concerns, considering the geographical stream, the area's water flow patterns etc.,
  - Safe disposal of asbestos
  - Consider and submit detailed plans to avoid harming the existing environment that would include the community garden, nearby garden birds and any other wild species
  - Public Safety. There was a need to submit a plan that considered general traffic density on Ffriddoedd Road, especially at peak times
  - To consider the laudable community benefit to this deprived local community
  - Make good / compensate the community for any damage to the garden.

c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application subject to including an additional condition about an environmental management plan prior to commencing the work - to include working hours, noise and dust.

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

- The investment was significant to Bangor
- Welcomed that the building was for education purposes
- Needed to ensure that the modern additions suited the old buildings
- Needed to keep the dignity of the building and not take away from the striking appearance
- Did not wish to see further deterioration to the building that would lead to its demolition

**RESOLVED to approve with conditions subject to receiving further information and positive observations from the Drainage Unit**

1. **5 years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Archaeological condition**
4. **Details of secondary glazing to be agreed beforehand**
5. **Agree to reuse materials from the building to be demolished**
6. **Aluminium rainwater goods**
7. **Specifications of solar panels**

8. **Details of any lights to be agreed**
9. **Details of any signs to be agreed**
10. **Details of the screen by the stairs to be submitted before its installation**
11. **Details of how the footprint of the gym will be recorded must be submitted before its demolition**
12. **Submit samples of the materials**
13. **Use of lime with any pointing/rendering work**
14. **Highways Condition**
15. **Welsh Water Conditions**
16. **Language Conditions**
17. **Biodiversity conditions including agreeing mitigation measures and completing the improvements**
18. **Agree on a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) before work commences – to include working hours**

### **5.3 APPLICATION NUMBER C25/0706/11/CR**

**Coleg Menai, Friars Building, Coleg Menai, Ffriddoedd Road, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2TS**

Listed building application to demolish rear extensions and erect a new two-storey extension along with internal alterations to the main building.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that part of the main building, which is visible from Ffriddoedd Road, was a very impressive two-storey building made of stone and built around 1899. It was reported that evidence existed which showed that the school evolved and developed over time, and by the 1940s this was the building that existed - a grade II listed building. It was noted that two other separate buildings formed part of the site, but they did not form part of the application.

The proposal was to demolish the two-storey rear section added in the 1930s and erect a new modern two-storey extension to enable teaching rooms to be brought up to modern standards. The extension would be finished with a mix of light grey/red brick and red aluminium cladding. The front elevation, which was the southern elevation facing Ffriddoedd Road, would remain as it is, as this was the original part. On the western side of the main building, it is proposed to remove the existing car port and remove mechanical ventilation equipment from the roof and install new vents.

In the context of internal adaptations, it was proposed to remove a lot of modern work that had been added over time, close existing openings and open new ones, remove false ceilings, install new party walls, remove the internal wall but retain the parts on the side, repair the windows, as well as remove modern plaster from the walls. Several original doors also existed, and the intention was to preserve and reuse these.

Information was submitted as part of the application which highlighted that part of the building that was intended for demolition was quite contemporary with the main building, however, due to a significant lack of maintenance over time, it was noted that this part was in a poor condition and the size and space of the rooms were unsuitable for the University's requirements as a lecture hall. Although an extensive record had been made of the building, with the rear sections being important to the development and history of the site, it was elaborated that it was not possible to convert these for lecture use and it was considered that their demolition and providing a more suitable space would provide a long-term future for the site. It was also noted that an effort had been made to re-use the materials from the part that was to be demolished and retain the gymnasium footprint on the floor within the new extension to preserve the evidence of the location. The internal

work would mean removing modern unsuitable features and restoring the building's typical and historical elements.

It was explained that the extension was of a modern design which suited the design and colour finish features of the main building; the plan from the front elevation showed parts of the new extension being visible, and following receiving additional information that considered the nature of the land raising up from the main road, the extension would not be visible from the front. Despite being visible from the other sides, it was considered that this would be acceptable in terms of seeing the building in its entirety and the extension would not take away from the appearance or the importance of the main building, but instead, it would show the evolution of the building over time, as had happened with the building's historic extensions.

Given the importance and the significant weight on the statutory duty to retain the listed building, the significance of the asset, the extent of the damage, justification for the work, and the public benefits, the Officers had noted that the proposed development represented a just and proportionate intervention and complied with local and national planning policies. They recommended to approve the application with conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member noted that she was supportive of the application
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application

**RESOLVED to approve the application subject to the following conditions:**

1. **5 years**
2. **In accordance with the plans**
3. **Heneb conditions**
4. **Details of secondary glazing to be agreed beforehand**
5. **Agree to reuse materials from the building to be demolished**
6. **Aluminium rainwater goods**
7. **Specifications of solar panels**
8. **Details of any lights to be agreed**
9. **Details of any signs to be agreed**
10. **Details of the screen by the stairs to be submitted before its installation**
11. **Details of how the footprint of the gym will be recorded must be submitted before its demolition**
12. **Submit samples of the materials**
13. **Use of lime with any pointing/rendering work**

#### **5.4 APPLICATION NUMBER C25/0710/41/LL**

##### **Land adjacent to Brynhyfryd / Cae Capel, Chwilog, LL53 6SF**

Erection of 25 affordable houses, creation of new vehicular access off the B4354 as well as associated work

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that most of the area of this full application was within a site which had been accepted and earmarked as suitable for residential development by means of its designation in the LDP for this specific proposal. It was noted that the status of Chwilog (a village defined as a Service Village within the LDP) meant that new houses to serve Gwynedd as a whole was expected for this site as in other similar cases on designated sites throughout the County. Attention was drawn to the fact that a section in the

north-west of the site was outside the designation of the development boundary itself and therefore, this section was considered as an exception site.

It was explained that the class 2 public road B4354 ran parallel with the northern boundary of the site; there were residential homes directly abutting the eastern boundary of the site, and residential homes on the other side of the road to the north. It was noted that the section of the site outside the boundary abutted the north-western part of the main site and currently formed part of the curtilage of the adjacent residential property - Brynhyfryd Farm.

The proposal, specifically, would include 6 one-bedroom flats, 9 two-bedroom houses, 8 three-bedroom houses and 2 two-bedroom bungalows - the proposed development offered 100% affordable housing with a mix provided in terms of occupancy. In terms of appearance, the houses would be finished in a mix of materials to convey different styles and to vary the appearance on the site.

It was reported that the Planning Committee had already approved the principle of a residential development on this designated site on three past occasions, and it was highlighted that the policy considerations made on two previous applications remained the same - it was considered that there was justification and demand for the proposal, and it continued to address the needs of the local community. Information was submitted as part of this application from the Housing Strategic Unit clearly showing the demand.

In terms of the land outside the development boundary and the designation that formed the exception site, it was explained that the requirements of policy TAI 16 applied to this element of placing four houses in this part of the site (2 three-bedroom houses, 1 two-bedroom house and 1 two-bedroom bungalow). In terms of considering the demand for the four houses, it was elaborated that the local definition included the village of Chwillog itself as well as the nearby rural area (a distance of 6km from the application site and the entire area of any Community Council divided by the 6km distance, excluding property within the development boundary of any settlement, except for the settlement where the application is located). It was highlighted that information on the need for affordable housing had been submitted as a part of the planning application and they would be provided as housing on intermediate and social rent - there would be 2 two-bedroom units for social rent for the local demand in Chwillog.

It was noted that figures on the need for Chwillog (social rent), indicated that some have a local connection and there were seven on the list who needed a two-bedroom house, with a local connection. In terms of the two houses let on intermediate rent, information from the Tai Teg register confirmed that three on the list lived in Chwillog and had a local connection and were therefore eligible for the units. Based on the information submitted as part of the application, it was considered that a suitable need had been confirmed for the development, and the section of the proposal located outside the boundary formed a logical extension to the village.

In the context of the Welsh language, the Language Unit, in their response to the consultation, noted that the linguistic assessment submitted was comprehensive, looking at the history of developments in the area, a comprehensive study area and an analysis of the current linguistic position. They also noted that the statement had included presumptions on the fluency of prospective tenants, and the potential linguistic impact and that the assessment had confirmed the local need. It was acknowledged that concerns had been raised regarding the proposal, but no irrefutable evidence had been submitted to show that the proposal would have a detrimental effect on the Language. Consequently, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of policy PS1 and the relevant supplementary planning guidance.

In the context of visual and residential amenities, it was noted that the site was located on the outskirts of the village, and it was not considered that it would have a significant visual impact on the landscape and would suit the built context of the existing area and the rest of the village. The report also included a full assessment of the amended proposal on general and residential amenities, and it was not considered that the proposal was likely to have a significant detrimental impact on nearby residents.

It was reiterated that matters of transport, biodiversity, infrastructure and archaeology had been addressed and had received a full assessment, and it was considered that they were acceptable subject to planning conditions.

In the context of open spaces, reference was made to the proposed plan that included providing a public open space in the south-eastern corner of the site that would also include a sustainable drainage area. It was explained, as it was not possible to provide play equipment on this section, a contribution to provide equipment in another area would be relevant.

In the context of educational matters, it was noted that capacity was available within the local School in connection with this development, but as had happened for other sites designated within Chwilog, it was considered essential that the three designated sites were considered in terms of the impact on education locally. Consequently, it would be impossible to anticipate which site would be developed first and that it would not be reasonable for the first developer to pay a higher contribution. Therefore, in fairness, it was decided that all contributions would be divided equally so that the three designated sites would face the same costs, and to this end, an educational contribution was needed for this application.

It was considered that the proposal complied with the requirements of local and national policies and therefore, the officers recommended to approve the application subject to a 106 or unilateral agreement for an open and educational space contribution and relevant conditions.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:

- The majority of Chwilog residents objected to the application.
- Many estates had already been built in the village over previous years and building more would have a negative impact on the community, including the school and the Welsh language.
- There were not enough facilities in the village to allow more people into the village - no shop, post office or a regular bus service.
- Health and safety concerns about the site's risk assessment - the pavement from the entrance ended on the 'clawdd' boundary of the telephone exchange. This meant that residents who would use the pavement would have to step out into the road to continue their journey - very dangerous to the elderly, the disabled and children.
- On behalf of Cadnant, a company called SAP Transport Planning had conducted a survey in terms of amount, size and the speed of vehicles going up and down the village - the data highlighted, from the direction of Y Ffôr, it appeared that 85% of vehicles drove more than 20mph and, from the direction of Cricieth, that 60% drove over 20mph - this needed the attention of the Council's Highways Unit. The survey was completed in February, the quietest month of the year, and should it be conducted in the busiest summer month, this would present very different conclusions and highlight that the development was located next to a very busy road.

- The Council had improved the speed bumps in the village and there was a need for a further survey to prove that the speed bumps had made a difference to slow traffic speed.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the agent noted the following observations:
- The application was submitted jointly between Grŵp Cynefin and Williams Homes Y Bala to address the increasing need for affordable housing.
  - The development would be led by Grŵp Cynefin, with support from the Welsh Government Housing Grant, under the control of Cyngor Gwynedd through a development programme - the grant was earmarked to develop the plan within this financial year.
  - Most of the site was within the LDP housing designation and was designated for 20 houses.
  - There was planning permission for 21 houses, to include seven affordable houses on the site since 2017, which was renewed in 2022 and continued to be valid and it could be implemented - the permission was approved in accordance with the LDP which remained operational and therefore the situation between the current permission and the application in question was comparative and was a relevant planning matter to be considered by the committee.
  - Cynefin had worked closely with the Housing Department to ensure that the type and housing mix supported the Housing Strategy and responded to the housing crisis.
  - The Housing Strategic Unit had confirmed that the proposal addressed the need for housing.
  - There had been a lot of public consultation; a meeting with the Community Council and the Local Member prior to submitting the application; discussed with the Planning Department and statutory consultants.
  - Discussions with the Highways Department had led to changes such as improving road safety by upgrading a nearby 'speed cushion' to be a 'raised table' and installing a formal crossing for pedestrians.
  - A comprehensive linguistic assessment had been submitted and there was no evidence that the proposal would have a harmful impact on the Language - it addressed Policy PS1.
  - The Allocation Policy addressed local connection and a high % of Welsh speakers - the policy had received consideration by the Language Commissioner who had noted that the policy was completely appropriate.
  - The proposal would provide housing to local people.
- ch) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- That he objected the application.
  - The Community Council was unanimous in refusing the application.
  - Almost everyone from the village was against the development - there was a petition, that had been signed by 160 residents in a short period of time (a significant number in a village the size of Chwillog).  
There were clear, appropriate grounds to object on the petition - the proposal was a large development; there was no evidence of the local need of this scale; it would change the character of the village; it would lead to a detrimental linguistic impact; an impact on traffic and infrastructure.
  - No e-mail noting the full observations of the Community Council had been included in the report, but the developer's information was included in full - no fair play to the voice of the local community - this in itself was grounds to refuse.
  - There were several grounds to refuse:
  - Growth that was not properly anticipated and was incompatible with Policy TAI3 - this was a development of a large scale and would change the village.

- It was contrary to policy ISA 2 and ISA 1 - there was no appropriate infrastructure in place, not many services and not enough space in the local school. Traffic levels were high and there were no suitable footpaths from the village to other places.
- The Chwilog housing designation in the LDP was 38, but 36 had already been constructed during the current LDP's life. Another 25 would be far above the designation of 38 which would lead to an over-development - a 10% increase in the village's housing stock and almost double the social housing stock in one application.
- Failure to satisfy Policy PS1 and TAN 20 - a thorough and meaningful assessment was required of the linguistic impact - no quantitative modelling of the impact of 25 units or mitigation measures had been recommended e.g., local allocation policy. In addition, there was no action plan for the development with the Welsh language or evidence regarding how the linguistic character of Chwilog could be protected. This made the development contrary to PSI, TAI 3 and the principles of TAN 20. No consideration to the reduction in the percentage of speakers over time with housing turnover or consideration to the residents of the new houses (most likely, these had not been completely validated by the County Council). The data also did not validate the language of households or the village's language use. Chwilog was amongst the highest in Dwyfor with 80% of Welsh speakers - the application was contrary to PS 1 sub-clause 4. Applications that caused linguistic harm should not be approved - this development was too big and too soon, which threatened the village's linguistic capacity.
- Contrary to Policy TAI 8 sub-clause 4 - where the correct mix of housing and occupancy must be ensured to satisfy the area's current community needs - there was no mix of occupancy - it doubled the social housing stock in one application.
- The data was contrary to what was recommended by Planning Policy Wales - namely the need for local data to be owned locally - this was where there was data of wide regional interest which gave a misunderstanding of the genuine need in the village.
- The houses were outside the development boundary - Policy TAI 16 noted that they had to be subject to a local residence clause. This was a promise - an empty promise? A 106 local condition was required to ensure that the four houses were for local people.
- There were several grounds to refuse the application and therefore the Committee was encouraged to refuse it.

d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application

dd) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by the Members:

- The proposal was part of the Gwynedd Housing Strategy.
- Most of the site was within the development boundary.
- There was existing permission on the site for 21 days.
- There were 79 names on the housing list.
- The proposal offered 100% affordable housing.
- An appropriate mix of housing.
- There was a need for a thorough and robust language assessment. The linguistic statement had been submitted by the developer - therefore, how could a decisive conclusion be reached?
- Concern about the impact on the Welsh language. Another introduction to the village could undermine the Welsh population that was already in the village.
- There was a failure to comply with Policy TAI 3 - there was a need for the development to be proportional with the village's scale.
- Some units were outside the development boundary - a mechanism had to be in place to ensure there was a 106 agreement on them.
- Contrary to Policy PCYFF 2 - it created a detrimental impact on the local community.

- 36 houses had already been constructed. The village's capacity, in accordance with the LDP, was 38. Anything more than 38 would be too much and Chwilog would be unable to support the community.
- Any housing developments had to reasonably fit the village - 25 was too much, too soon.
- There was a need to look at the Gwynedd Housing Allocation Policy.
- The existing permission of seven affordable housing would have been acceptable - why not continue with this?
- How could the local need be evidenced? A local detailed assessment was required, supported by vast research - why were there no observations by the Local Housing Facilitator?
- Generally, units for one person were not easy to fill.
- The educational contribution was insufficient.
- The houses had been squeezed together - this was likely to lead to a dispute between tenants.
- There was no assurance of the justification for local housing in the exception site.
- The Community Council had unanimously refused the application.
- Suspicion about the 'local demand' for housing.
- There was not enough space in the school.
- That Housing Associations 'leading' on this was best - was it not the local opinion that was most important? The local opinion in this case was completely clear - 25 dwellings was too much for a village the size of Chwilog. There was a need to listen to the voice of the local community - a petition had been submitted.
- Chwilog was an area of linguistic significance in terms of the Welsh language.
- The right houses in the wrong place. The change was too big, too soon which would impact the character of the village.

- e) In response to the observations, the Assistant Head noted that information about Chwilog's indicative supply had been clearly explained in the report, as well as evidence about the demand - there was specific justification about the county need evidence and the rationale for the four houses (located outside the development boundary) was limited to the local need. He reiterated that the Language Unit's observations noted that the linguistic statement submitted was detailed.

The Monitoring Officer elaborated that the statutory role of the Committee was to make objective decisions based on evidence. He noted that the four houses on the exception site had specific conditions in accordance with requirements; that planning history highlighted that there was already permission given for 20 houses on the designated site that would include seven affordable houses. With evidence on the need and views expressed about the impact on the Welsh language, the committee must submit evidence to the contrary should they refuse the application.

- f) A request was made for a registered vote:

In accordance with the Procedural Rules, the following vote was recorded on the proposal to approve:-

**In favour: 3** - Councillors Elwyn Edwards, Edgar Owen, Anne Lloyd Jones.

**Against: 10** - Councillors Elin Hywel, Cai Larsen, Gareth A Roberts, Berwyn Parry Jones, Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Gareth Tudor Jones, Huw Rowlands, Louise Hughes, John Pughe Roberts and Gruffydd Williams.

**Abstaining: 0**

The proposal fell.

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application based on a lack of need for the affordable housing located on the part of the site that forms an exception site.

In response, the Assistant Head of the Department noted, should the application be refused, he would refer the application to a cooling off period.

**RESOLVED to refuse the application contrary to the recommendation.**

**Reason: On the basis of a lack of need for the affordable housing located on the part of the site that forms an exception site.**

**As a result, the application will be referred to a cooling off period and will return to the Committee on another date with a report highlighting risks arising from this reason for refusal and the reasons noted by the Local Member during the Committee.**

## **5.5 APPLICATION NUMBER C25/0947/25/EIA**

Pentir Sub-station, Bangor, LL57 4ED

Replacing existing underground cables and the installation of new cross-site underground cables at the current Pentir sub-station as well as associated works.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form - guidance to impose a condition by the Assembly's Transport Unit.

- a) The Planning Officer highlighted that the proposal was part of a wider project to reinforce overhead lines and cables on the existing circuits between the Pentir and Trawsfynydd sub-stations; the Project was part of the wider network transmission upgrades needed to facilitate the work of connecting 50 Gigawatt of offshore wind energy by 2030.

It was explained that the proposed works will be fully incorporated within the existing footprint of Pentir Sub-station and will utilise the existing access road, storage areas, welfare facilities, office spaces, and staff car park. Reference was made to the Environmental Statement which provided an overview of the Project, the main alternatives considered in the development of the Project (where appropriate), information about the current environment, and an assessment of the likely significant impacts of the Project. Where appropriate, it was noted that mitigation measures have been included to avoid, prevent, reduce or offset significant adverse environmental impacts.

Increasing capacity on the existing transmission line between Pentir and Trawsfynydd sub-stations has been identified as a step that urgently needs to be taken to provide more transmission capacity, and is acknowledged by Ofgem.

Reference was made to policy ISA 1 which was supportive of proposals regarding water, electricity, gas services, etc. to improve the local provision, subject to detailed planning considerations. In the context of policy ADN 3, although the development is not a renewable energy scheme, it would form part of the support network that could be used in managing the renewable supply. To this end, it could be considered part of the renewable energy network. A thorough assessment was conducted of the relevant criteria, and it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of principle and complied with Criterion 1 Policy ADN3 in terms of the fact that all impacts had been sufficiently mitigated.

Similarly, it was noted that policies PCYFF 5, PS 5, PS 6 and PS 7 are supportive of schemes for the development of renewable technologies that contribute to protecting the environment and mitigating climate change and this plan therefore met the objectives of these policies.

In the context of transport and access matters, once it is operational, there will be no demand for additional vehicular access to the site and there will be no long-term impacts on highway safety deriving from the development. It was noted that the Assembly's Transport Unit was happy with the development subject to conditions and, consequently, it was considered that the proposal complied with the requirements of Policy TRA 2 and TRA 4 of the LDP in terms of highway safety and convenience.

In terms of archaeology and heritage matters, it was highlighted that there were many Scheduled Monuments in the site's vicinity. Heneb noted that the desk assessment was very thorough and had been written well and they agreed with the conclusion of the Assessment of the Environmental Impact (AEA); the application was therefore acceptable under policies PS 20 - impact on heritage features and AT 4 of the LDP - the protection of sites of archaeological importance from harm.

A Welsh Language Statement was submitted as part of the application which had considered the potential impacts of the Pentir proposed work on the use of the Welsh language in the local community. Although no adverse effects were identified in the assessment, measures were proposed to ensure that the use of the Welsh language was maintained. An Environmental Statement was also submitted which assessed the impact on the environment and it was concluded that, with the imposition of planning conditions, the impacts of the development could be satisfactorily mitigated and environmental features protected.

The visual and landscape impacts were considered acceptable as the works were within an already developed site and the development protected the amenities of residential properties around the site satisfactorily.

It was reported that the proposed development would extend and improve electricity connections across north Wales with the economic benefits acknowledged. Having considered all the relevant planning matters including the local and national policies and guidance, the officers recommended to approve the application with conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's representatives made the following observations:
- The application included work that would occur within the existing Pentir National Grid Sub-station and part of the Pentir to Trawsfynydd Project that would reinforce and restore the existing line between Pentir and Trawsfynydd.
  - The work would provide more capacity in the network and allow the network to be safer whilst allowing more clean energy to supply homes and businesses.
  - The work forming part of the application normally would be considered as an 'approved development'. However, because the work forms part of the Pentir to Trawsfynydd Project, with planning applications being submitted to the Planning Committee in the coming months, planning permission was required for the work.
  - The work proposed as part of the application will occur within the existing boundaries of the Pentir Sub-station site and include replacing the existing underground cables, as well as installing new underground cables across the site.

- The planning officers expressed that the work was acceptable and recommended to approve with conditions.
  - He asked the Committee kindly to support the application, which formed a key part of the work to reinforce the network between Pentir and Trawsfynydd.
- c) The Monitoring Officer noted that the Local Member (Councillor Menna Baines) had noted in an e-mail that she had no objection to the recommendation.
- ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application

**RESOLVED to approve with conditions**

- 1. 5 years**
- 2. In accordance with the plans, all recommendations in the documents and assessments, and the approved Environmental Statement.**
- 3. Public Protection Conditions**
- 4. Trunk Road Conditions**
- 5. Compliance with the Green Infrastructure Statement along with future maintenance work.**
- 6. Ensure bilingual signage with priority given to the Welsh language.**
- 7. The applicant must submit to the Local Planning Authority a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) which will satisfy the Welsh Government, as the Overseeing Organisation for the Strategic Road Network (SRN).**

The meeting commenced at 13:00 and concluded at 15:50

---

**CHAIR**