
PLANNING COMMITTEE 13/07/26

Attendance: Chair: Councillor Huw Rowlands
Vice-chair: Councillor Edgar Owen

Councillors:

Elwyn Edwards, Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Elin Hywel, Berwyn Parry Jones, Gareth T Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Cai Larsen, Dafydd Meurig, Gareth Coj Parry and Gruffydd Williams

Local Member: Councillor Menna Trenholme

Officers: Dafydd Williams (Head of Environment Department), Gwawr Hughes (Planning Manager), Elan Mared Lloyd (Senior Planning Officer), Rhys Cadwaladr (Senior Planning Officer - Minerals and Waste), Dafydd Jones (Solicitor) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillors John Pughe Roberts and Dyfrig Siencyn.

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

- a) Councillor Cai Larsen declared an interest in item 5.2 (C25/0671/14/LL) as he was Chair of the Governing Body of Ysgol Syr Hugh Owen. The Member believed that it was a prejudicial interest and he therefore withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the application.

Councillor Huw Rowlands declared an interest in item 5.4 (C24/0323/14/LL) and 5.5 (C24/0755/19/LL) as he had submitted observations on the applications. The Member believed that it was a prejudicial interest and he therefore withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the applications.

- b) Dafydd Williams (Head of Environment) declared an interest in item 5.1 (C26/0238/15/LL) as he lived in the same area. The officer was of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest and he therefore withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the application.

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

Councillor Elwyn Edwards (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.3 (C24/1032/04/LL) on the agenda.

Councillor Menna Trenholme (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 (C24/0323/14/LL) and 5.5 (C24/0755/19/LL) on the agenda.

Councillor Cai Larsen (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 (C24/0323/14/LL) and 5.5 (C24/0755/19/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 15 June 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.

6. APPLICATION NO C26/0238/15/LL LAND ADJACENT TO 10 WARDEN STREET, LLANBERIS, LL55 4HP

Erection of new dwelling

- a) The Senior Planning Manager - Minerals and Waste highlighted that the application had been submitted to the Planning Committee on 15 June 2026, where a decision had been deferred in order to undertake a site visit. A site visit was conducted on 8 July 2026.

It was noted that it was a full application for the erection of a family dwelling of a detached two-storey design, with the gable end of the property facing the public road; the proposed house would be of a modern pitched roof design built into the slope. It would measure approximately 7.2m high to the highest point of the roof, with a balcony on a substantial terrace being installed to the rear of the property which would extend out approximately 2.5m and serve the floor.

An application for a single property on this site (26.02.2026) under reference C25/0927/15/LL had been refused. Although some amendments had been made to the plans of the current application, including the removal of two first-floor openings that faced the property next door and reducing the size of the balcony so that it did not extend out past the house's side elevation, the size and layout of the property generally continued to be the same in terms of size and scale.

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee for a decision at the Local Member's request.

Reference was made to Policy TAI 15 of the Local Development Plan (LDP) which stated that Councils would seek to ensure an appropriate level of affordable housing in the plan area. Two or more housing units was the threshold, and as only one unit was proposed in this case, Policy TAI 15 was not relevant and it was not necessary to provide an affordable element.

In the context of visual amenities, it was noted that Policy PCYFF 3 required developments to offer a design of high quality that respected and assimilated with the character and context of the area. In this case, it was considered that the proposed house did not reflect the traditional design of the adjacent terraced houses on Warden Street. Although the design had been modified somewhat since the previous application, its bulk, height and more contemporary features continued to appear disproportionate and out of character with the local environment. In addition, as the site was on a slope,

the dwelling would sit higher than the surrounding houses and therefore stand out in the landscape. As a result, it was considered that the building would create an oppressive effect and would not naturally blend into the streetscape or the surrounding landscape. The proposal therefore did not add to or enhance the character or appearance of the area, and was contrary to the requirements of Policy PCYFF 3. Although some materials attempted to refer to the historic landscape, it was considered that a more sensitive design for the site could be submitted.

In terms of general and residential amenities, reference was made to significant concerns regarding the impact of the development on nearby properties. Although the proposed balcony had been reduced, it remained a prominent feature at the rear of the property and was likely to cause overlooking and privacy issues – these risks particularly affected residents of the neighbouring chapel and No. 10 Warden Street.

In addition, it was considered that the location and layout of the property meant that movements in and out of the new house would take place in a narrow gap near No. 10, rather than towards the street like the rest of the houses. This would create a sense of oppression and negatively impact the residential amenities of that property. As a result, the proposal was considered to have an unacceptable impact on nearby residents and was therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy PCYFF 2.

It was considered that the biodiversity improvement measures proposed, which included tree planting and the installation of bird and bat boxes, met the requirements of policies PS 19 and AMG 5. In the context of drainage matters, a SUDS application had been submitted and approved - the proposal was acceptable and complied with the requirements of TAN 15.

Although observations had not been received by the Transportation Unit, as there was only one dwelling, it was not considered that the development would have an unacceptable impact on the safety or operation of the road network; the application provided three parking spaces for the property, and therefore it complied with the requirements of policies TRA 2 and TRA 4 of the LDP.

It was explained that the property would provide a family home for a local person from the village and therefore it was not considered that it would be detrimental to the Welsh language. It was noted that a condition could be imposed should the application be approved, to ensure a Welsh name for the dwelling, to comply with the requirements of Policy PS 1.

The Planning Officers recommended that the application be refused as the proposed development was unacceptable in its existing form. Although some aspects of the plan were acceptable, it was considered that the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the area, as well as its impact on the amenities of nearby properties, meant that the proposal did not fully meet the requirements of relevant policies.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation.
- c) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
 - The design was too large for the site
 - A correct design for the site was required

RESOLVED: To refuse

Reasons:

1. The modern design of the proposed dwelling, with its large balcony and glass doors/windows on the front and rear elevations, does not respect the character of the neighbouring houses nor that which is within the vicinity and these features would be incongruous. The proposal would not complement nor enhance the character and appearance of the site or area. The proposal has not given full consideration to its historical and built context and that in terms of its siting, appearance, scale, height, massing and elevational treatment contains incoherent, dominant and alien features that do not respect the streetscape or site context. The proposal is therefore, considered contrary to criteria 1, 2 and 3 of Policy PCYFF 3: Design and Place Shaping of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan (2011-2026).
2. Due to the location, size and height of the balcony and the front of the proposed dwelling which faces the next-door property, it is considered that the proposal would overlook and have a dominant and overbearing impact and would be detrimental to the amenities of nearby residents in terms of noise and nuisance. For this reason, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policy PCYFF 2 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan (2011-2026) relating to protecting the amenities of residents and the local area.

7. APPLICATION NO C25/0671/14/LL YSGOL SYR HUGH OWEN Ffordd Bethel, CAERNARFON, GWYNEDD, LL55 1HW

Erect a new 2400mm high fence around part of the playing field boundary of Ysgol Syr Hugh Owen

- a) The application was submitted to the Planning Committee because the Local Member had declared an interest and provided comments on the application.

It was highlighted that comments from the statutory and public consultation mostly referred to concerns arising from neighbours stating that it was an unnecessary development creating a visual impact, an impact on residential amenities and a human rights impact. A letter had also been received supporting the fence because there were problems with stones being thrown, trespassing on private property and litter being thrown into gardens.

Reference was made to Policy ISA 2, relating to community facilities that included schools, and stated that the LDP would assist in the maintenance and improvement of community facilities. The proposal would be located on the boundaries of an existing school and the fence would be needed around the building to improve security within the school grounds. In terms of principle, the proposal was considered to be reasonable and in line with the principle of Policy ISA 2 of the LDP.

The proposed fence would be a green "weldmesh", which is a see-through

fence – therefore it was considered that it would not create a closed or oppressive view of the school or the surrounding houses. As it was in keeping with the existing school fencing and allowed visibility, it was considered that it would not create a visual impact in the area, and it therefore complied with Policy PCYFF 3.

It was reported that some neighbouring residents had objected on the grounds of visual impact and oppressive feeling, but it was noted that fencing of this type was common in schools to protect staff and pupils. As similar fencing already existed around the site, the proposal was consistent with the environment. The new fence would be approximately 4-5 metres from the rear of the houses, providing an adequate gap so that it did not have a significant impact on private amenities. It was reiterated that consideration had to be given to the need to protect pupils and school grounds as well as the land outside the school from damage, and on balance it was considered that this type of fence would not cause significant harm to the amenities of the local neighbourhood, and therefore it complied with Policy PCYFF 2 of the LDP. In addition, it was highlighted that trees had a protection order along the boundary with a condition to be imposed to ensure that no work on the trees was carried out without prior permission – this would protect the trees as part of the development.

The proposal did not meet the thresholds for the submission of a Welsh Language Statement or a Welsh Language Impact Assessment Report; however, it was not considered to be detrimental to the Welsh language and therefore it complied with the requirements of Policy PS 1.

It was considered that the planning matters had been addressed in full with some comments referring to operational matters. The land ownership certificate was not considered to be incorrect, as the applicant was acting on behalf of the school and the Council, and the content of certain documents submitted was not considered to be incorrect or defective. It was reiterated that it was a matter for the applicant to contact neighbouring landowners and there was no obligation to do this under the Planning system.

It was considered that the proposal was acceptable and complied with the relevant policies. It was recommended to approve the application with conditions.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- c) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
 - The layout of the fence on the boundary appeared intrusive – installing it 3-4 metres away from the wall would be acceptable
 - The access to the gap between the fence and the wall would have to be managed – a need to conduct discussions to get this sorted
 - The fence appeared to be oppressive – needed to discuss and agree on its location

In response to an observation regarding reducing the height of the fence to 2m as 2.4m appeared high and whether the intention was to safeguard children or keep

children in, it was noted that 2.4m was in line with other fences around the school. It was reiterated that a 2m fence could be erected without Planning permission.

In response to observations relating to the location of the fence, it was noted that discussions would be held with those residents who had gardens abutting the fence and that it was possible to impose a condition to agree on the exact location. It was reiterated, although sufficient information had been submitted to confirm the location of the fence, there would be a need to hold discussions with the landowners to get rights of access to operate.

RESOLVED: To approve with conditions

- 1. Five years**
- 2. In accordance with the plans**
- 3. A dark green colour**
- 4. Biodiversity enhancements**

Note

This permission does not cover any work to trees that are protected under a Tree Preservation Order. Separate consent will be required for any works to the protected trees.

8. APPLICATION NO C24/1032/04/LL LAND BY LL23 7NR, FRONGOCH, LL23 7NR

Temporary operation of a meteorological mast and associated structures for a period of up to five years.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form that included observations from Natural Resources Wales (NRW) agreeing with the conclusion of the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

- a) The Senior Planning Officer - Minerals and Waste highlighted that the application related to the erection and operation of a temporary anemometer mast for a period of five years on an upland near the summit of Pen y Bwlch Gwyn. The mast would be a steel lattice structure up to 100m high, supported by guy wires and equipped with meteorological monitoring equipment, including anemometers and weathervanes. It was noted that many important landscape and conservation designations were relatively close - Eryri National Park, the proposed boundary of Glyndŵr National Park and the Clwydian Range and Dee Valley AONB; this site was also within the vicinity of several designated European sites, such as the SAC, SPA and RAMSAR sites - River Dee and Llyn Tegid, Migneint-Arenig-Dduallt and Berwyn.

In the context of the principle of the proposal, it was noted that there was no specific policy in the LDP relating to meteorology masts. However, the purpose of the proposed mast was to collect meteorology data to assess the viability of the potential wind energy development in the future, and therefore the proposal was considered as a type of infrastructure associated with a renewable energy development against Strategic Policy PS 7 of the LDP; a policy that supported renewable energy technologies, as well as Policy ADN 1 that related to wind energy developments on land.

It was reported, since adopting the LDP, the Strategic Search Areas noted in

TAN 8 had been replaced by the Pre-assessed Areas noted in Future Wales: The National Plan 2040. Reference was made to Policy 17 of Future Wales which established presumptions in favour of wind energy developments on a large scale within those areas, whilst Policy 18 provided the relevant criteria to assess such proposals.

It was reiterated that the site in question had been located outside of the nearest Pre-assessed Area for wind energy. However, Future Wales and Planning Policy Wales did not prevent wind energy developments or associated infrastructure outside those areas. Instead, the Pre-assessed Areas stated where the Welsh Government had assessed that large-scale wind developments could be accepted in principle, without preventing consideration of proposals in other locations.

In addition, Planning Policy Wales stated that energy-generating projects on the land with a capacity of between 10MW and 350MW were determined by Welsh Ministers through the Developments of National Significance (DNS) process and assessed against the Future Wales policies. To this end, it was noted that a notice of intention had been submitted to Welsh Ministers for a potential wind farm on the same site. However, the existing application does not relate to the wind farm itself and weighting could not be given to the principle of that development when assessing the application. The anemometer mast must be considered on its own merits.

It was emphasised that the proposal related to a temporary structure for a five-year period only. Planning conditions would ensure that the mast, the guy wires and all associated infrastructure were taken from the site and the land would be restored to its previous condition at the end of the period. Consequently, it was considered that the development was not likely to lead to permanent or long-term impacts on the site. It was also considered that the principle of installing a temporary anemometer mast for the purpose of gathering meteorology data was acceptable in policy, subject to a detailed consideration of the relevant impacts, including landscape, visibility, biodiversity, heritage, amenities and other technical matters.

In the context of visual matters, it was noted that policies PCYFF 3, AMG 2 and AMG 3 of the LDP were relevant when assessing the impact of the development on the character of the landscape and visual amenities. The site would be located on high land within the 'Cefnwlad y Bala' Special Landscape Area, and in a location that was seen from parts of Eryri National Park. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVA) was submitted to support the application, as well as additional information on viewpoints. Following reviewing the information, it was reported that NRW was satisfied that sufficient evidence had been provided to assess the impacts on the landscape and the visual amenities, and concluded that the development would not harm the character of the landscape, the visual amenity nor the special characteristics of Eryri National Park. It was acknowledged that the 100m high mast would be visible over a wide area and it would present an element of human work in some open views. However, the assessment showed that small or low impacts would arise in most perspectives, with some moderate or moderate-low impacts in a limited number of sensitive locations; the mast's slender lattice structure, as well as its temporary nature, would reduce its general visual impact.

Given the view of NRW, the findings of the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, and the temporary nature of the development, it was considered that the proposal would not lead to unacceptable impacts on the landscape or

visual amenities and it would comply with the requirements of policies PCYFF 3, AMG 2 and AMG 3 of the LDP.

In the context of Residential Amenities and given the distance between the site and the nearest residential property, as well as the relatively simple nature of the development, the narrow design of the mast and the land's topography influence, it was not considered that it would have an unacceptable impact on the visual amenity or general residential amenities. Consequently, it was considered that the development complied with the requirements of Policy PCYFF 2 of the LDP, which sought to ensure that developments did not have a significant detrimental impact on the health, safety or amenities of nearby residents.

In relation to proposed aviation lights, it was noted that the lights would be low density infra-red lights and therefore it was not considered that they would have a significant visual impact or cause unacceptable light pollution to nearby properties.

Observations were received regarding the possibility of noise, but because the mast included very few mobile parts, it was not expected for it to generate substantial operational noise. In addition, any temporary disruption during the construction phase would be limited in terms of its length and would be controlled through standard construction practices. On this basis, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of amenities and complied with Policy PCYFF 2.

Given Transport Matters, it was noted that the proposed development did not include any changes to the existing access arrangements and it was not anticipated that it would lead to a significant increase in traffic movements during the operational period. Consequently, the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the safety or implementation of the local road network and therefore, in terms of transport, would comply with the requirements of Policies PS 4 and TRA 4 of the LDP.

In the context of Ecological Matters, it was reported that the site was located relatively close to many designated European sites, including the Dee River and Llyn Tegid SAC, the Migneint-Arenig-Dduallt SAC/SPA, the Llyn Tegid RAMSAR site and the Berwyn SAC/SPA. NRW noted that the main risks arising from the construction period, especially in relation to pollution, would be sedimentation and disruption to water courses. However, it was considered that these risks could be controlled by ensuring a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) condition. NRW confirmed, subject to implementing appropriate mitigation measures, that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of the designated sites. It was also not considered that the development would likely lead to significant impacts in terms of nutrients or water quality during the operational phase.

From an ecological perspective, although concerns had been raised in relation to nesting birds, specifically the possibility that the mast could act as a perch for predators, it was considered that this matter could be controlled through a Breeding Bird Protection Plan (BBPP). NRW and the Council's Ecologist were satisfied that the development was unlikely to have a significant impact on protected species or sensitive habitats, with a very limited habitat loss deriving from the proposal. The Habitat Regulation Assessment came to the conclusion that the main risks to European sites could be controlled, which related mainly to the construction phase and breeding birds, through appropriate planning conditions, including a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

and a Breeding Bird Protection Plan (BBPP). As a result, it was considered that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the integrity of any European site, either in isolation or in conjunction with other plans or projects. Subject to appropriate conditions that ensured the implementation of the mitigation measures and the proposed biodiversity improvements, it was considered that the development was acceptable and complied with Policies PS 19, AMG 3, AMG 5 and GWA 1 of the LDP.

There were no heritage designations near the site and CADW confirmed that they had no objection to the development. It was considered that the mast would not have an impact on designated heritage assets because the land's topography restricted the visible connection between it and those assets; the proposal complied with the requirements of Policy PS 20 of the LDP.

It was highlighted that the site was located within the Low Flying Area 7 training area. The Ministry of Defence confirmed that they had no objection to the development, subject to imposing standard conditions relating to obstruction lights for aviation, chartered aviation and relevant safety requirements. It was considered that these conditions were necessary to ensure that the mast would not have a detrimental impact on aviation safety or military low flying operations and therefore complied with the requirements of Policy PCYFF 2 of the LDP.

As the development did not reach the threshold requiring a Welsh Language Statement, and due to its temporary and limited nature, it was not considered that it would have a detrimental impact on the Welsh language and therefore complied with Policy PS 1 of the LDP and the Maintaining and Creating Unique and Sustainable Communities SPG.

It was considered that the principle of the development was acceptable as associated infrastructure for renewable energy and it would not lead to long-term impacts because the mast would be removed, and the site restored at the end of a 5-year period. It was not considered that it would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape, amenities, biodiversity, designated European sites, heritage, aviation safety, subject to imposing appropriate conditions; the development complied with the relevant local and national policies and the recommendation was to approve subject to conditions.

- b) The Local Member noted that he agreed with the recommendation.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
 - There were sufficient conditions to ensure control
 - This was one mast to gather data about wind speed - what would come in its wake? A wind farm and ugly pylons that would try to connect to the national grid

RESOLVED: To delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. The development should commence within five years of the date of the decision.**
- 2. The development must be undertaken in accordance with the following approved plans and documents.**
- 3. The mast hereby approved must be taken down and the land restored**

to its previous condition within 5 years to the date of commission. The applicant must inform the Local Planning Authority of the commission date within 3 months of that date.

4. Prior to the commencement of the development (including the land work and clearance of vegetation), a detailed Method Statement that describes how the site will be returned to its original condition will be submitted to the Local Planning Authority, and it must be approved in writing. The approved measures should be adhered to and implemented in full.
5. No development, including site clearance, will commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing by it.
6. No development or phase of the development to commence until a Breeding Bird Protection Plan (BBPP) has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved by it.
7. No development shall be permitted until a biodiversity enhancement plan has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority and approved in writing by it. The development will be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
8. No clearance of vegetation, land work or building activities will be permitted during the bird nesting season (1 March to 31 August inclusive) unless this has been agreed in writing beforehand with the Local Planning Authority. When work is required during this period, a survey of the site must be undertaken by a competent ecologist no more than 48 hours prior to commencing the work. Any recommendations given must be fully implemented, and if active nests are found, an appropriate protection zone must be established and maintained until the chicks have fledged.
9. Devices to divert birds must be installed on each external supporting wire of the mast at a distance of no more than 2 metres in length along them all prior to the mast becoming operational. These devices must be maintained throughout the development's lifespan. Any damaged, removed or disconnected devices must be replaced within one month of finding them.
10. Prior to commencement of building any meteorological masts, or using any construction equipment or temporary structure(s) of 50 metres or more in height (above ground level), the developer must submit an aviation lighting scheme to be approved by Cyngor Gwynedd jointly with the Ministry of Defence, noting how the development will be illuminated throughout its lifespan to maintain the safety requirements of civil and military aviation as determined necessary by the Ministry of Defence.

This should include:

- a) The details of any construction equipment and temporary structures with a total height of 50 metres or more (above ground level) that will be used during the construction of the meteorological mast, together with the details of any aviation warning lights that will be installed on them; and
- b) Location and height of every meteorological mast within the development, noting those with aviation warning lights, location of the lights on the mast, the type of lights to be used, and the lighting performance specifications.

Then the developer must install the lights as noted in the approved aviation lighting plan, and the lights will continue to be operational throughout the development's lifespan.

11. The developer must inform the Ministry of Defence in writing, at least 14 days prior to the commencement of the work, of the following information:
 - a) the commencement date to erect the meteorological mast(s);
 - b) the maximum height of any construction equipment used when erecting the mast;
 - c) the date when any meteorological mast comes into use;
 - d) the latitude, longitude and maximum height of each meteorological mast.
12. The Ministry of Defence must also be informed of any changes to this information and following the completion of the construction work.

9. APPLICATION NO C24/0323/14/LL LAND BY MURIAU PARK HOTEL, FFORDD BONT SAINT, CAERNARFON, GWYNEDD, LL55 2YS

Proposed petrol filling station, electric vehicle charging hub, retail building and creation of new access and associated works to include landscaping.

Some Members of the Committee had visited the site on 8 July 2026.

The Planning Manager highlighted that an application, supported by a letter, had been submitted by the agent of application 5.4 asking for application 5.4 and application 5.5 to be deferred because some matters required further attention. In response to the application, the Planning Manager noted that the Highways Unit had now submitted observations confirming that they did not object to the application and the proposal therefore complied with criterion 3 of Policy TRA 1, as well as Policy TRA 4 in terms of road safety. As a result, the first reason for refusal (as it appeared in the report) was removed. It was reiterated that the Local Planning Authority's objections to the application highlighted that the location was unsuitable, and sufficient information had been submitted for the Members to make a decision on both applications.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form which included an additional reason for refusal to reflect the intrusive impact of the development. It was highlighted that the reason stated that the development did not reflect a sensitive or appropriate approach to design and it appeared incongruous and intrusive within its context; it therefore did not comply with policies PCYFF 3 and PCYFF 4 which ensured that proposals and the landscaping plans respected their context and their location in the local landscape.

- a) The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that this was a full application for the construction of a service station which would provide fuel to vehicles and included an electric car charging hub, a retail building, along with the creation of a new entrance and associated works including landscaping.

It was reported that the site was located outside the development boundary as noted in the LDP and although it was not located within any special land designation, it was noted that the site was within the Afon Gwyrfaï Special Area of Conservation consultation zone on the basis of Phosphorus impact. It is located directly adjacent to the A487, which was part of the strategic road network, with the nature of the development focusing on providing a service to users of this road. The principle of the development was assessed through Policies TRA 1 and PCYFF1 of the LDP.

It was explained that the shop element was located within the same building as the till area for fuel and from the information submitted, the size of the retail area would be defined as a 'small shop', within the LDP. It was therefore considered that a shop of this size would be an ancillary element to the primary purpose of providing fuel and breaks from travelling, and therefore it was not considered that it would likely undermine the retail provision of nearby centres.

It was expressed that proposed developments that led to an increase in the phosphorus load within the catchment area could lead to detrimental impacts on water quality and therefore on the ecological condition of the SAC. Information was submitted as part of the application that confirmed that there was an intention to connect to the Caernarfon Waste Treatment site, with comments from Welsh Water confirming that this was acceptable; it was not considered that the proposal would have any impact on the Afon Gwyrfaei phosphorus levels and therefore the proposal showed neutrality in terms of this.

In the context of visual, general and residential amenities, it was considered that the proposal, due to its location, scale and use was unacceptable as a result of the level of disruption and an increase in activity compared with the current situation - contrary to criterion 7 of Policy PCYFF 2 which safeguarded the amenities of local property occupiers. The site was not considered suitable for a development of this nature, especially given its prominence in the landscape and the failure to minimise the visual impact.

In addition, the proposal may cause a significant impact on the Glynllifon SAC, specifically the lesser horseshoe bat which was a feature of this SAC (evidence that the area is used by lesser horseshoe bats and that this proposal would disrupt the hedges used by bats). It was reported that insufficient information had been submitted as part of the application for the Authority to complete an Appropriate Assessment in this case, and therefore it was concluded that no assurance could be given that the proposal would not have a significant or detrimental impact on the SAC. It was reiterated that a green infrastructure statement had not been submitted as part of the application which led to uncertainty that the proposal complied with the requirements of Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales.

In the context of Land Drainage, Ground Water and Flooding, it was noted that the site included a designated main river (Afon Rhosdican) and concerns regarding the development and the future flood risk to the proposal and to third parties. It was noted that insufficient information had been submitted as part of the application to ensure suitable and sufficient access for machines to enable maintenance work of the main river in the future and provide a flood flow route/buffer zone to the main river; without this relevant information, it was considered that it could not be ensured that the proposal complied with the requirements of criterion number 4 in Policy PS6.

It was reiterated that insufficient information had been submitted as part of the application to assess the impact as a result of any contamination in the land. To this end, it could not be confirmed that this proposal would comply with the requirements of criterion 7 of Policy PCYFF 2 or Policy PS6.

Sufficient evidence was not submitted as part of the planning application to highlight that full consideration had been given to the impact of losing the best and most versatile agricultural land and therefore it was considered that the application was contrary to the requirements of criterion 6 of Policy PS 6, as well

as the advice given in paragraphs 3.58 and 3.59 of Planning Policy Wales.

Also, additional information was received regarding the petrol tanks and NRW was re-consulted. To date, no reply had been received to the further consultation and therefore the fifth reason for refusal was amended to reflect this.

Having considered all the relevant planning matters, including local and national policies and guidelines, as well as all the observations received, it was considered that the proposal was unacceptable in the form that it was submitted as it was unable to fulfil the requirements of the relevant policies and guidelines.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:
- She had been the owner of Muriau Park, a nearby hotel, for 38 years and had faced many challenges in that period. This was a new challenge
 - The land on the site was agricultural, rich land in a beautiful location - the proposal would ruin the environment
 - Cwmni Cadnant had not considered the local policies - the document discussed her hotel, and she could not imagine such a development on her doorstep
 - There were fuel stations in Dolydd, Caeathro and Caernarfon that employed locally - what would be the impact on these businesses? Loss of jobs? Closure? - the local economy must be considered
 - The area was a green area - why choose this location with such a plan?
 - The access would go from the old road - was there an intention to conduct a traffic assessment to monitor the genuine significance of activity in this situation - risk of accidents?
 - Asked the Committee to adhere to the policies and legislations and refuse the plan.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following observations:
- The application had been submitted prematurely, and this was because matters had not been resolved in full
 - Basic concern had been raised about the visual impact and the reason for refusal had been submitted to the applicant for the first time in the late observations
 - The impact of ground water and nearby river continued to be discussed by NRW
 - NRW had no objection on the grounds of the impact on bats
 - There was no intention to erect a 4m acoustic fence as had been stated; the landscaping plan highlighted a 3m fence and a substantial hedge along the northern boundary - the applicant was happy to look into this further and discuss with officers and the neighbour
 - The reference to agricultural land was not grounds for an objection - this had been made clear during the consultation period
 - Referring to the Horncastle Court Case; when discussing two similar applications alongside each other in a committee, they must be considered together after being reviewed appropriately and in full - based on the Committee meeting today, the Local Planning Authority would be open to the possibility of a judicial review - a complete plan had been submitted here as the Motor Fuel Group (MFG) had been secured for the charging facilities and the petrol station
 - The company already operated the Morrisons fuel station in Caernarfon - they had no intention to close that station should the application be

approved

- MFG asked that the Committee deferred the decision on both application in fairness to an employer in the town and one that had invested significantly

ch) The Local Members had no observations to propose.

d) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the recommendation.

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

- There was enough fuel provision in the town
- The proposal would lead to a loss of good agricultural land

RESOLVED: To Refuse

Reasons:

- 1. The proposal, due to its location, scale and use is considered to be unacceptable as a result of the level of disturbance and increase in activity compared to the current situation and as a result, the proposal is considered to be contrary to criterion 7 of Policy PCYFF 2 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026, which safeguards the amenities of local property occupiers.**
- 2. The test of the likely significant impact suggests that the proposal may cause a significant impact on the Glynllifon SAC, particularly the lesser horseshoe bat which is a feature of this SAC, as a result of the location of the proposal, the evidence that the area is used by lesser horseshoe bats and that the proposal affects the hedges used by the bats. Insufficient information has been submitted as part of the application to enable the Local Planning Authority to complete an Appropriate Assessment in this case in accordance with the Authority's requirements under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017. It is therefore concluded that there can be no assurance that the proposal will not have a significant or adverse effect on the SAC due to the lack of information and therefore the proposal does not comply with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.**
- 3. A green infrastructure statement has not been submitted as part of the application and therefore there is no assurance that the proposal complies with the requirements of Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales (2024) in terms of the step-wise approach and biodiversity improvements.**
- 4. Insufficient information had currently been submitted as part of the application to assess the impact as a result of any contamination in the land. To this end, it cannot be confirmed whether the proposal complied with the requirements of criterion 7 of Policy PCYFF 2 or Policy PS6 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd LDP 2011-2026.**

5. The site includes a designated main river (Afon Rhosdican) and there are concerns about this development and the future flood risk to the proposal and to third parties. Insufficient information has been submitted as part of the application to ensure suitable and adequate access for machinery to enable future maintenance of the main river and provide a flood flow route/buffer zone to the main river. It was considered, without this information, that it could not be ensured that the proposal complied with the requirements of criterion number 4 of Policy PS6 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd LDP 2011-2026.
6. Insufficient evidence has been submitted as part of the planning application to demonstrate that full consideration has been given to the loss of the best and most versatile agricultural land. It was therefore considered that the application was contrary to the requirements of criterion 6 of Policy PS 6 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd LDP 2011-2026, as well as the advice given in paragraphs 3.58 and 3.59 of Planning Policy Wales.
7. The development did not reflect a sensitive or appropriate approach to design. It appeared incompatible and intrusive within its context, and therefore it did not comply with policies PCYFF 3 and PCYFF 4 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd LDP 2011-2026 which ensured that proposals and landscaping plans respected their context and their location in the local landscape.

10. APPLICATION NO C24/0755/19/LL LAND ADJACENT TO MEIFOD ROUNDABOUT, MEIFOD FARM, PWLLHELI ROAD, BONTNEWYDD, LL55 2TY

Roadside services and associated work.

Some Committee Members had visited the site on 8 July 2026.

- a) The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that this was a full application for a service station which would provide fuel to vehicles, including an associated shop for a site near the Meifod roundabout. It was explained that the site had been located directly adjacent to the A487 strategic road network and access to the site would be from the roundabout on Pwllheli Road. It was elaborated that the site was outside the development boundary as noted in the LDP; although the site was not located within any other land designations, it was within the Afon Gwyrfai Special Area of Conservation consultation zone on the basis of Phosphorus impact and approximately 300m away from a Wildlife Site.

It was considered that the development would not impede the movement of strategic traffic and confirmation was received that the entrance was safe in terms of highway safety. In addition, the shop located within the same building as the till area for fuel would be an ancillary element to the primary purpose of providing fuel and breaks from travelling, and therefore it was not considered that the shop would likely undermine the retail provision of nearby centres; it complied with Policy TRA 1 of the LDP.

It was elaborated that there was a clear functional and locational rationale for the proposed site, and there were no sites that were more appropriate within the development boundaries. It was considered that the proposal was acceptable in principle under the requirements of Policy PCYFF 1 - the site offered a suitable location within the landscape to provide the development, restricting its visual impact and respecting the landscape and the local environment; consequently, it complied with the relevant requirements of policies PCYFF 3 and PCYFF 4 of the LDP.

It was not expected for the proposal to significantly add to the existing disruption or disrupt residential amenities to an unacceptable extent, subject to relevant conditions. To this end, it was considered that the development complied with policies PCYFF 2 and 3 of the LDP as a result of residential and general amenities.

In the context of transport and access matters, the Transportation Unit had no concerns in terms of traffic levels in and out of the site, nor in terms of the internal arrangements. It was reiterated that the Government's Trunk Roads Unit was also satisfied with the proposal. It was reported that the conditions would be imposed to ensure that the surface water was appropriately managed and to protect the car share provision.

In the context of biodiversity matters, it was noted that the proposed site was located within the consultation zone of the Afon Gwyrfai Special Area of Conservation on the basis of Phosphorus impact, and in particular because there was an intention to connect to the main sewer (the Waste Treatment Site serving the area was the Llanfaglan site which discharged into Afon Gwyrfai). It was reiterated that information had been submitted as part of the application confirming that there was an intention to connect to the Caernarfon Waste Treatment Site instead of Llanfaglan, and Welsh Water's comments confirmed that this was acceptable, subject to connecting to a specific point which would need to be ensured by a planning condition.

The site was located approximately 4.5km away from the immediate parts of the Glynllifon Special Area of Conservation (SAC). The information submitted as part of the application was considered, as were NRW's comments which suggested that the Lighting Impact Assessment and the Biodiversity Enhancement and Soft Landscaping Plan provided sufficient grounds to consider the potential impacts of the plan on the lesser horseshoe bat species as a feature of the SAC.

In terms of improving biodiversity, the development provided a wide range of measures to create new habitats and to increase ecological variety on the site. Overall, the plan went beyond mitigating impact, providing a net improvement to biodiversity by increasing the size and quality of habitats on the site compared with the existing condition. It was acknowledged that there would be an initial impact on biodiversity as a result of the development, particularly during the construction phase, but given the nature and size of the biodiversity enhancements proposed which included the creation of new habitats, planting native trees and hedges, providing specific features for wildlife, it was considered that the development would lead to net improvement to biodiversity in the long term.

It was explained that the proposed site was grade 3b agricultural land, and therefore it was not considered to be the best and most versatile agricultural

land. It was considered that it would be acceptable to use the site for the development and it therefore complied with the requirements of criterion 6 of Policy PS6 of the LDP.

Reference was made to further observations that the agent had provided on the principle matters of the application, a public consultation, the need for the development, ecology, agricultural land and documents that they had not recorded which meant that some conditions proposed had received attention. However, the observations did not change the content of the report - all the documents submitted had received attention and the responses to the consultation confirmed that some of the documents would need to be amended which would be ensured through planning conditions.

It was considered that all the valid planning matters raised during the public consultations had been fully considered with the development complying with the relevant policies, specifically Policy TRA 1 which related to the principle of the proposal - the policy did not require a specific need for the development, but instead that it ensured that it focused on fulfilling the needs of drivers. It can be concluded that the proposal for the fuel station development and the associated work was acceptable, as it did not lead to an unacceptable impact on the area or its environment. Given the mitigation measures and the appropriate control through planning conditions, it can be ensured that there would not be a negative impact as a result of the proposal. The Planning Officers recommended to approve the development with appropriate conditions.

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

- The decision must be made based on evidence, the LDP and advice from professional officers and not on the grounds of the commercial interests of competitive applicants who were unable to submit a high-quality complete application
- That Policy TRA 1 supported roadside service developments that were located on the A487 - the purpose was to serve vehicles that already used the A487 - the Government had stated an immense need for roadside services like this
- In terms of traffic, the Transportation Unit and the Welsh Government fully supported the development - a detailed transport assessment confirmed that there would not be an unacceptable impact on the roads
- Despite respecting local concerns, the development would be a proposal to serve existing traffic
- That every request for additional information from consultants had received a response from experts - it was a shame that the responses had not been reflected in the report
- A host of assessments had been submitted on ecology, bats, birds, reptiles, air quality, lighting, drainage, etc. - the plan provided a significant net improvement to biodiversity, and it went beyond the requirements of Planning Policy Wales
- The plan had significantly evolved since the start - it had now been halved in terms of size, and the retail element had been reduced - the shop was an ancillary element to the roadside service and not an independent retail unit
- It provided 11 car charging points of the best standard
- Connection with the grid had been approved by SPN Energy
- There would be bilingual signs promoting the Welsh language on the site - a leading and important development for north Wales

- Over 100 people had attended the public meeting; 850 letters were distributed and after the plan was fully explained, approximately 10 letters of objections had been received from the public
- The proposal had been developed carefully; it fully complied with planning policies; it provided important transport infrastructure to the area and north Wales; it improved biodiversity and brought economic advantages
- The Policy supported the use. The development had been carefully planned in the landscape. There were no technical objections. It proposed a clear improvement to biodiversity and the development brought genuine benefits to the area
- A request for the Committee to follow the recommendation of the Officers and approve the application

c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the local member, Councillor Menna Trenholme, made the following observations:

- She wished to object to the application and encouraged the Committee to refuse it.
- She questioned whether the development, in this location, complied with the LDP and the relevant planning policies. In her opinion, it did not do this.
- The site was located outside of the development boundary, in open countryside; Policy PCYFF 1 set clear presumptions against such development unless there was strong justification. She did not believe that the applicant had proved that need. Therefore, she asked a fundamental question, was this truly the most appropriate location for such a development?
- If the applicant tried to rely on Policy TRA 1 - Transport Network Developments, the policy imposed clear conditions - it demanded that the areas of the roadside service had the least possible impact on natural environment and landscape, that it did not impede the movement of strategic traffic and did not undermine retail provisions in existing centres. She did not believe that it satisfied that criteria.
- Would a development of this nature be more suitable on a brownfield site or land that had already been developed, where the necessary infrastructure already existed? For example, sites such as the Cibyn area in Caernarfon showed that land which already had connections to road, services and commercial infrastructure was available. Using such a site would avoid the loss of green land, reduce the impact on the landscape and comply better with sustainable planning principles. The application had not demonstrated why a new countryside site was the best option when other more appropriate choices existed.
- The loss of green land for a commercial development would be a serious step, especially when other options were available. There were already fuel stations in Caernarfon, Dolydd, Bangor, Pwllheli, Porthmadog and Caeathro and a number of electric vehicle charging points were already available, as well as plenty of cafés, restaurants and shops. The application did not fill a gap in the provision; it is likely to take business away from local providers that already served the area. In addition, fuel stations existed within a reasonable distance along the A487 - from this site, there is a station in Clynog - 8 miles away, Llys y Gwynt - 10 miles and Y Ffôr - 16 miles. Considering this alongside the provision in Pwllheli, Caernarfon, Bangor and Porthmadog, there is already a comprehensive network serving the area. The application did not respond to a local shortage or provide a service that was unavailable.

- It was contrary to the LDP's objectives, which tried to maintain the vitality of town centres. A large commercial development on the outskirts of Caernarfon would attract spending away from local businesses and undermine the work being made to strengthen the town centre. Also contrary to PS15 - Town Centre and Retail Developments which tried to protect the vitality and viability of town centres. Instead of attracting people to the centre of Caernarfon and its businesses, this development would take people's spending before reaching the town.
- Serious concerns regarding traffic and road safety. The Bontnewydd bypass was built to take traffic from the village, improve safety and ensure a better flow on the network and not to attract new commercial developments that would create more journeys for vehicles. Had sufficient consideration been given to the impact on the roundabout that was already very busy? It was reasonable to expect vehicles to slow down and queue when turning into the fuel station, having an impact on the traffic flow and increasing the risk of congestion and collisions on the strategic network. The development would undermine the purpose of the bypass.
- The environmental impact caused concern - constructing on a green site meant the loss of agricultural land, a permanent change to the landscape and increased emissions due to more traffic. Biodiversity was also a cause for concern - although mitigation measures could be proposed, a development of this size would lead to a loss of rural habitats and introduce more artificial light, more noise, more activity to an area that was currently relatively quiet and impact the local landscape and wildlife.
- Drawing attention to the matter of litter, which was often disregarded. Evidence from Keep Britain Tidy and National Highways showed that litter associated with food and drink "to go" was a significant problem along highways. The problem was not confined within the site's boundaries - experience across the UK showed that food packaging, coffee cups, bottles and cans were often discarded on roadsides, in hedges and on agricultural land away from the place of purchase. Although the applicant could provide bins on the site, he could not control where users choose to discard their litter after leaving. In this type of rural area, it would impact the Bontnewydd countryside and the nearby area.
- Policy MAN6 - Retail in the countryside presumed against these types of retail developments unless they satisfied all of the relevant criteria. There was no existing business on the site, vacant commercial sites were available in Caernarfon, and it was clear that the development would have an impact on local shops.
- Concern about the impact of the development on local residents. A commercial site of this size would introduce more light, noise, vehicle movement and activity to an area that was currently in open countryside.
- Bontnewydd Community Council had unanimously objected to the application, and referred in detail to Policy CYFF1, TRA1, PS15, MAN6 and MAN7 as grounds for objections; Llanwnda Community Council and Caernarfon Town Council had also objected to the application; therefore three local Town/Community Councils were unanimously against the development. Although the number of objections itself was not grounds to refuse an application, it clearly highlighted that the community saw the development as one that would change the nature of the area for the worse.
- Considering the process, some time had passed since the public consultation, and a fair question arose as to whether the information gathered at that time continued to be completely up-to-date given the time that had passed.

- It was disappointing that the application was before the Committee so late in the day. As a Local Member, she would have welcomed more time to consider the final report and the information before making a decision on a development that had significant implications for the area.
- There was a duty on the Committee to make a decision in accordance with the LDP unless there were firm planning reasons to divert from it.
- Was there a real need for this site? The applicant had not proven the need for it. The site was outside the development boundary. The development would harm the countryside, undermine local businesses and raise real concerns regarding traffic, safety and environmental impact. Put simply, the alleged benefits did not outweigh the harm.
- Respectfully asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Councillor Cai Larsen had no further comments to propose.

ch) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application, contrary to the recommendation.

Reasons:

- The proposal did not fully comply with the sustainability principles of Policy PS6
- It would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the area and nearby residents, and this was contrary to criterion 7 of Policy PCYFF 2
- The proposal would have a detrimental visual impact, and this was contrary to policy PCYFF 3
- The proposal to mitigate the impact of the proposal in terms of biodiversity or biodiversity enhancements was insufficient and therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy PS19.

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

- The Government's statistics on the demand for fossil fuel highlighted less use following carbon regulations in the future and an increase in the use of electric cars - therefore did not see the need according to Policies PCYFF5, PS4, PS5 and PS6. If required, only a charging resource would be needed
- Acknowledged that such a station would create litter along the roads and incur costs for the Council
- Disagreed with the statement 'respond to the existing demand' - that local businesses and stations along the road would be happy with the business, therefore should we not encourage and promote local businesses that provide the current service - these were services in local communities that took pride in their businesses - need to encourage instead of building new ones
- It would create a visual impact on the amenities of nearby residents
- The station was likely to be labelled as the last one on the road and would therefore prevent people from using other stations
- The need was being met by what already existed
- EV stations were being developed by the Council and continued to have infrastructure problems - therefore how would we know that these would succeed?
- A community station had been developed in Clynnog - the station had regenerated the village - this development would have an impact on that station and others locally.
- The relevant Community Councils were unanimous in objecting strongly

and the rationale for their objections was fair

- PCYFF1 - the proposal was located outside the development boundary - it was not an 'exceptional' location
- PCYFF 1 - there was sufficient provision in the area, therefore there was a need to challenge the need and consider the cumulative impact
- Policy 6 Retail - the retail unit and the fuel station would pose a threat to local businesses
- Policy 7 Retail - there would be an increase in litter and noise on roadsides and an increase in noise and light pollution
- There was a need to protect and improve the natural environment - the proposal was contrary to Policy 19 - the impact of the development on biodiversity - the mitigation measures and the enhancement work was insufficient
- It created an unacceptable impact on the visual amenities of the area - contrary to PCYFF3
- Why refuse the Muriau Park application but approve Meifod? It seemed that officers had turned every stone to refuse the Muriau Park application, but made every effort to turn every stone to approve Meifod
- Given the current fuel and living costs, was it fair to approve a site where fuel was more expensive than local stations?
- An intrusive impact on the local landscape - the location was unsuitable for the development
- The location and the roundabout were already busy - how could adding more traffic be justified?
- It was located on good and useful agricultural land - did not want to lose good land
- EV power equipment appeared everywhere by now - there was no need for them to be in a fuel station - they could be installed anywhere.

The Planning Manager highlighted that the proposal included a combination of proposals, such as fossil fuel provision, EV charging, park and ride provision, and therefore it would be difficult to evidence against this as the proposal provided for the current need. She elaborated that consultants had responded without objecting to the proposal in the context of the need, but some matters were matters of opinion - a visual impact and impact on amenities. It was noted that none of the policies required to prove the need for the development. She reiterated that Policy TRA1 was suitable if the development was close to a highway that provided for drivers, and PS 4 was suitable if the development provided a transport service and identified different travel needs - she suggested that the Committee considered the location instead of the need.

She noted that Policy PCYFF 1 did not object to developments outside of the boundary, unless it would comply with other policies, e.g. in the context of this application, the suitability of this development outside of the boundary was considered because the requirements of Policy TRA1 noted the need for the development to be close to a highway and provide a service for the drivers of those highways. Consequently, it would comply with Policy PCYFF1. In terms of the impact on other local centres, it was considered that the size of the shop was irrelevant as it was ancillary to the development therefore it would not have an impact on the businesses of the town and nearby villages; suggested for the Committee not to consider this matter as an objection, unless there was relevant evidence to support that.

RESOLVED: To refuse, contrary to the recommendation
Reasons:

1. The proposal did not fully align with the sustainability principles - in accordance with Policy PS6
2. The proposal had a detrimental impact on the amenities of the area and nearby residents - contrary to criterion 7 of Policy PCYFF 2
3. The proposal would have a detrimental visual impact - contrary to Policy PCYFF 3
4. The proposal does not sufficiently mitigate the impact in terms of biodiversity or biodiversity enhancements - contrary to the requirements of Policy PS19.

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 3.00 pm

CHAIRMAN