
PLANNING COMMITTEE 7/09/26

Present:

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

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, John Pughe Roberts, Dyfrig Siencyn and Gruffydd Williams

Officers: Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Environment), Gwawr Hughes (Planning Manager), Rebeca Siân Dafydd (Senior Planning Officer), Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Services – Monitoring Officer), and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

Others invited to the meeting: Local Members - Councillor Gareth Williams and Councillor Rhys Tudur

1. APOLOGIES

None to note

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 Rhys Tudur (who was not a Member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 (C25/0710/41/LL) on the agenda

Councillor Gareth Williams (who was not a Member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.2 (C26/0216/30/LL) on the agenda

Councillor Elwyn Edwards (who was a Member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.3 (C25/0273/04/LL) on the agenda

- b) The Chair highlighted that Committee Members and Planning Officers had received a letter from the applicant of application 5.1 (C25/0710/41/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 13 July 2026 as a correct 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 C25/0710/41/LL LAND ADJOINING BRYNHYFRYD/ CAE CAPEL, CHWILOG, LL53 6SF

Erection of 20 affordable homes, creation of new vehicular access from the B4354 along with associated works

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application to erect 20 affordable homes along with the creation of a new vehicular access and associated developments. It was reported that the site had now been amended and was in its entirety on a site specifically designated for a T64 housing development within the Chwilog development boundary, with the number of houses proposed reduced from 25 to 20 to enable this.

It was explained that plots nos. 16-19 (Two 3 bed houses, one 2 bed house and one 2 bed bungalow) from the original plan had been deleted, and that plots 24 - 25 had been changed from two 1 bed flats to one 2 bed house. The proposal did not provide units outside the development boundary, providing 100% affordable housing with a mix of occupancy. The proposed plan included the provision of public open space and a sustainable drainage area.

Members were reminded that the application had been submitted to the Planning Committee on 27 April 2026, where it was decided to refuse the application on the grounds of one reason namely that *it was contrary to the LDP's Tai 16 Policy Exception Sites as it was not possible to demonstrate a need for the exempt land until the designated T64 site had been developed*, and therefore the application had been referred to a cooling-off period. Since then, the application had been specifically amended in response to the above refusal reason. It was highlighted that several revised documents and plans had been submitted to reflect the change, and a period of full re-consultation, including public consultation, had taken place. As the proposal had been amended in response to the objection of the Planning Committee, the application was being resubmitted for a decision based on the amendments.

Reference was made to responses to the second consultation and to those numbers who had a five year connection with Gwynedd and wished to live in Chwilog, together with an update of the need figures for the whole of Gwynedd which confirmed that there were 2103 people on the Housing Options register for Social housing with a five year connection with Gwynedd and 882 on the Tai Teg register. It was confirmed that the Housing Needs Report had been completed by the Rural Housing Facilitator and submitted as part of the application.

It was noted that the proposal would offer 100% affordable housing with the status of the village of Chwilog in the LDP meaning the expectation was for affordable units to serve the affordable need of Gwynedd (as was the case with other similar sites designated throughout the County). It was reiterated that the need had been proven and that the proposal complied with the requirements of the LDP's policies TAI 3, TAI 8 and TAI 15. It was emphasised that the proposal did not include the

provision of housing outside the development boundary, and therefore policy TAI 16 Exception Sites no longer applied to the application.

It was not considered that the houses would cause significant harm to the built quality of the site or the local neighbourhood and, consequently, it was considered that the development was acceptable under Policies PCYFF 2 and PCYFF 3 of the LDP as they related to these matters.

It was noted that the Language Unit had confirmed that the language statement had included assumptions of the fluency of prospective tenants, and the potential linguistic impact. While their most recent observations required confirmation of the local need, their previous observations for larger development had confirmed that they were satisfied that the assessment had confirmed the need locally. To this end, it was not considered that the proposal was contrary to the requirements of policy PS1 of the Local Development Plan.

In the context of Open Spaces, it was reported that the proposed development would offer an open area of 955m² on the site, but that play equipment was not being offered. It was considered that in such a case, and as had already been agreed with similar developments, that the proposal would be to secure a financial contribution through a 106 agreement or a unilateral agreement ensuring that the proposal was acceptable in accordance with the relevant requirements of policy ISA 5.

Confirmation was received from the Education Department that there was capacity within the local schools but given Chwilog's position as a whole in relation to the other designations, it was considered reasonable to secure a financial contribution by means of a 106 agreement or a unilateral agreement in this case, as had been done with the other designations. To this end it was considered that the proposal was acceptable and complied with the requirements of Policy ISA 1.

Reference was made to matters regarding highways, biodiversity, archaeology and land drainage matters noting that they were acceptable.

In closing, the Senior Manager noted that this was a proposal for an affordable housing development that had been designed to meet a specific need that had been proven and was located in its entirety on a site designated for housing within the village development boundary and which had received approval in the past for similar residential developments. As a result, the scheme was considered acceptable in principle and complied with the requirements of relevant local and national planning policies and guidance. The recommendation was to grant the application in accordance with appropriate conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- That the new-look application had been submitted with the number of units reduced from 25 to 20
 - However, it was considered that 20 new units in a small village like Chwilog remained too much and he therefore objected to the application
 - That the Community Council unanimously objected to the application - the Community Council's extended comments had been included in the report and the reasons for the objection were clear and numerous
 - That almost everyone in the village was against the development - a petition had been signed by 160 residents (a significant number in a village the size of Chwilog). There were clear, appropriate grounds for objecting on the petition - the proposal was a large development that would change the

village's character; Chwillog was a Welsh-speaking village and the development would likely lead to a reduction in the percentage of the Welsh-speaking population; no evidence of local need for housing of this scale in the ward, increased traffic levels and infrastructure pressures, capacity of the sewerage system and local services, such as the local school. It was disappointing that the petition had not been included as an appendix to the report - this would mean that fair play could be given to the local voice.

- There were several grounds for refusal:
- Contrary to policies ISA 2 and ISA 1 - there were no appropriate current facilities at Chwillog to cope with the development; the proper infrastructure was not in place, with not many services and no adequate space in the local school.
- Chwillog's indicative supply was 40 - 35 had been already built within the current LDP period. An additional 20 would be well over the 40-unit allocation which would lead to an overdevelopment and change the rural village of Chwillog. Two estates of 15 houses had already been built in the village - this was an application for 20 more
- Failure to satisfy PS1 Sub-clause 4 – 'causing damage to the linguistic structure of the village'. Erecting an additional 20 units would be too much of a change for the village to cope with, and would change the linguistic balance of the community; the size of the development was disproportionate to the size of the village and the change was too much, too soon; threatened the linguistic capacity of the school and the community to linguistically assimilate the development - this had not been assessed by the language assessment
- The language assessment was one that had been commissioned / paid for by the developer - it did not consider that the % of Welsh speakers of Social Housing in each area had fallen significantly over time due to a change of occupancy
- The language assessment did not consider statistics for new estates elsewhere in Gwynedd and did not ascertain the language of households or language use. It did not give a picture that corresponded to the census and the decline in Welsh speakers in each community since the LDP period
- The language assessment did not consider the linguistic harm of not having a local lettings policy system and the % of houses let to Welsh speakers. A Local Lettings Policy was essential in this case to mitigate linguistic harm
- Referring to the Prosiect Bro Compendium which stated that Chwillog was among the four strongest areas in Dwyfor in terms of being a linguistic stronghold for the Welsh language (speakers and households); there would be linguistic harm to the village if the occupants of the houses came from wider areas - this would be the result of the system for selecting occupants to social housing.
- The situation of building large estates without satisfying the local need
- That the development was disproportionate to the size of the village. There was nothing wrong with social housing, but the number in this case posed questions. 20 would double the number of social housing in the village in one go
- That the data was contrary to what was recommended by Planning Policy Wales – namely the need for locally relevant data – here there was data of broad regional interest which gave a false impression of the real need of the village – that some had 'chosen' Chwillog and nearby areas, and others had highlighted 'interest' rather than a real need – this did not give a picture of the real need locally
- There were several grounds to refuse the application. At the last meeting,

members voiced opinions to reject the application and he urged them to do the same again

- c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application, contrary to the recommendation

Reason: To refuse based on Strategic Policy 1: Sub-clause 4 - The development would cause substantial harm to the character and language balance of the community of Chwillog

In response, the Monitoring Officer stated that the application before them was smaller than the previous one, although it was similar in terms of features and impact. At the April 2026 committee, the application was refused with one refusal reason – that reason had now received attention and response from the applicant. In terms of propriety, the above reason for refusal was additional and would require evidence that would justify a refusal based on a language assessment.

- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- That the 'exempt' land had now been removed and the remainder of the site had been included in the LDP
 - That the percentage of Welsh speakers appeared higher in social housing estates compared to the percentage of the village - there was concern here of depriving Welsh speaking people of social housing
 - The number of designations at Chwillog may be due to lack of land for construction in Pwllheli - this is a need that was 'fairly local'
 - In sympathy with the Local Member - 20 was too much for the countryside, but bound to local policies, to the LDP and to Planning Inspectors. The designation is too much for a village
 - The principle had already been approved
 - The houses were 100% affordable
 - The need had been highlighted – that sufficient social housing must be built
 - If local people wished to stay locally in social housing, that was their choice, and therefore housing must be provided for them. By refusing, local people would move away
 - The local concern was understood, but the land was earmarked for 21 houses and some of those were open market houses
 - That the development was within the development boundary. A refusal would result in appeal costs.
 - It was welcomed that a Housing Needs Report had been completed by the Rural Housing Facilitator and submitted as part of the application.
 - Despite a mix in the type of house, it did not exactly correspond to local requirements: although 15 houses were 2/3 bedroom, 13 were local need; there had been no interest in the bungalow and letting one person flats was difficult
 - It was a strong application on a designated site, but 20 social housing units was too much for the small, rural, village of Chwillog
 - The impact on the character of Chwillog needed to be considered - Chwillog was a village of linguistic significance
 - 10 houses would be an acceptable number on the site with a children's play area
 - The language assessment stated that 'with the limited evidence available, we are of the view that granting the application will have a significant positive impact on the linguistic resilience of Chwillog'. This was a comfortable, confident statement based on 'limited evidence'

- There was pressure to grant the application by suggesting high appeal costs, and that an inspector from Cardiff would come to deliver an opinion even though he was not local to the area or aware of the situation of the Welsh language in Chwilog.
- That there was an extant planning application on the site - a planning application for 21 houses (7 affordable houses and the remainder being open market housing), so what were the arguments for having 20 affordable homes? Happy to grant open market housing, but not to allow housing for people who really needed housing in Gwynedd?
- The houses that had already been built in Chwilog and had a positive impact on the language there and therefore a comment in the language assessment confirmed what had already happened. Ysgol Chwilog had been recognised as one of the strongholds of the Welsh language
- It was a positive development in line with Cyngor Gwynedd's policies
- A recent development in Nefyn - 3 houses out of 14 let to people from Nefyn. There was nothing to prevent non-Welsh speaking people/families from getting housing in Chwilog
- If granted, there was a request for a condition to use a Local Letting Policy to prioritise local people and protect the Welsh language

In response to the request to impose a planning condition for the use of a Local Lettings Policy, the Monitoring Officer noted that the imposition of such a condition was not within the Committee's power.

The Assistant Head of Service added that if the application was refused, contrary to the recommendation, it would have to be referred to a cooling-off period due to the associated risks.

d) A request was made for a recorded vote:

In accordance with the Rules of Procedure, the following vote was recorded on the proposal to refuse the application:-

In favour: 6 - Councillors Huw Rowlands, Elwyn Edwards, Gareth T Jones, Elin Hywel. John Pughe Roberts, Gruffydd Williams

Against: 9 - Councillors Delyth Griffiths, Berwyn Parry Jones, Edgar Owen, Dafydd Meurig, Cai Larsen, Dyfrig Siencyn, Louise Hughes, Anne Lloyd Jones, Gareth Coj Parry

Abstaining: 0

The proposal fell.

dd) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application in accordance with the recommendation.

RESOLVED: To delegate the right to the Head of Environment Department to approve the application, subject to a 106 agreement or a unilateral agreement for an educational contribution and play equipment on an open space, together with the following conditions:

1. Time
2. Development to comply with the approved plans
3. A programme for providing affordable housing must be submitted

and agreed

4. The external materials including the roof slates must be agreed
5. Removal of Permitted Development Rights
6. Welsh Water / Drainage Condition
7. Highways Conditions
8. Biodiversity / CNC Conditions
9. Building Control Plan
10. A Welsh name for the housing estate and individual houses.
11. Restrict the use to C3 use class only
12. Complete landscaping

Note: Bat Licence

7. APPLICATION NO C26/0216/30/LL CARAVAN PARK, TIR GLYN, UWCHMYNYDD, PWLLHELI, GWYNEDD, LL53 8DA

Full application for the change of use of an agricultural field to accommodate 10 seasonal touring caravan pitches additional to the main site, the erection of a toilet/shower block, soft landscape improvements, proposed entrance/exit and installation of treatment plant.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application relating to extending the existing caravan site into agricultural land nearby. It was explained that there was planning permission for a separate site of 39 touring caravans on fields to the north and north-east of the application site together with an area north of the existing application site which had been granted under reference C16/0878/30/LL to store up to 15 touring caravans throughout the year. The remainder of the site consisted of agricultural buildings, outbuildings and two residential dwellings.

It was noted that the entire site was situated in the open countryside and within the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), and within the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest, and partly within Flood Zone 2/3 (Surface Water and Small Watercourses) as shown in the Flood Map for Planning. The site is served by an unclassified road that runs parallel to the farm and the existing caravan site. The development site would be partly within the Porth Meudwy wildlife site.

It was pointed out that there were established hedges on some of the verges of the site, particularly the western boundary with the public road. The land where the development was located had been described as existing agricultural land which was included within class 3a according to Welsh Government maps which meant that lands within class 3a along with class 1 and 3 lands were identified as the best and most versatile agricultural lands. In this case, it was identified as "good to moderate quality agricultural land".

The application was submitted to Committee as the site was larger in size than could be determined under the delegated procedure. It was reiterated that the proposal had been the subject of a planning application under reference C24/0413/30/LL, but the applicant had withdrawn the application before it reached the Planning Committee on 30.09.2024.

It was reported that there were plans to create additional formal pitches to an existing site for 10 seasonal touring caravans along with the erection of a

toilet/shower building, soft landscaping improvements, the creation of a proposed entrance/exit and the installation of treatment plant. Landscaping would take the form of planting a small coppice near the lowest side of the second entrance to the field in the southern part of the site while a new hedge would be planted to the rear of the proposed toilet block. It was highlighted that there was an existing hedge along the field boundary with the parallel public road, and the intention would be to manage this hedge and create an area of long grass between the hedge and the location of the 10 new pitches within the field.

In the context of the principle of development, it was noted that policy TWR 5 of the LDP required any touring caravan development to be readily assimilated into the landscape in a way that did not significantly harm the visual quality of the landscape. This development would be unavoidably harmful to this landscape within the AONB, and this was supported by the observations of the AONB Unit.

Although acknowledging the points made by the applicant in the additional information, including the landscape evaluation submitted, it did not change the fact that the site was visible in the landscape and that the extension in question would be in an entirely separate location to the existing touring caravan site near the farm. It was not considered that the extension to the site would be totally hidden by the existing features of the landscape and it was not considered that the proposal would integrate well with its surroundings. As a result, it was not considered that the proposal would do anything to maintain, enhance or restore the recognised character of the AONB and therefore the proposal was contrary to the requirements of Policies TWR 5, PCYFF 4 and AMG 1 of the LDP.

In the context of biodiversity issues, it was highlighted that insufficient information had been submitted as part of the application to enable the Local Planning Authority, as the competent authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications of the project for the Pen Llŷn and Sarnau Special Area of Conservation. The proposal therefore failed to show that it would protect or improve the natural environment and therefore the application was contrary to the requirements of Policies PS 19 and AMG 5 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan.

In addition, insufficient evidence was submitted as part of the planning application to show that full consideration had been given to the impact of the loss of 'best and most versatile agricultural land'. The application was contrary to the requirements of criterion 6 of Policy PS 6 of the LDP together with the advice provided in paragraphs 3.58 and 3.59 of Planning Policy Wales.

In the context of transport and access issues, it was highlighted that concerns had arisen in relation to the main entrance to the proposed site, in particular due to the potential for mud and loose material to be transported onto the public highway, as well as the potential for damage to the roadsides as a result of the increased traffic using the entrance. In order to mitigate these impacts and in the interest of highway safety, the Highways Unit had requested the applicant to upgrade the entrance to an appropriate and satisfactory standard and provide details of the proposed works, as well as restricting the second entrance to pedestrian and emergency services vehicle use only. It was considered that this would be a means of controlling incoming traffic movements and out of the premises, ensuring that all normal traffic used the main entrance which had been upgraded to an acceptable standard. The proposal was considered unacceptable and contrary to the requirements of policy TRA 4 of the LDP which confirmed that proposals that would cause unacceptable harm to the safe and efficient operation of the highway would

be refused.

It was highlighted that a drainage statement had not been submitted as part of the application, and sufficient information had not been submitted to ensure that the proposal complied with the requirements of part 7 of Technical Advice Note (TAN) 15: Development, flooding and coastal erosion; the application was considered to be contrary to this policy. It was explained that the site of the proposed development was partly located within Flood Zone 2/3 (Surface Water and Small Watercourses) as shown in the Flood Map for Planning. Again, a Flood Risk Assessment was not submitted as part of the application and therefore it could not be certain that the proposal would not be at an unacceptable risk of surface water flooding and therefore the application as submitted was contrary to the requirements of Section 6.1 TAN 15: Development, flooding and coastal erosion.

In addition, the advice given within TAN 15 stated that sites should not be set aside for very vulnerable new developments (which included residential developments including touring caravans) as flood risk and consequences were not considered acceptable for these types of development within flood zone 3. In a situation where the proposal was acceptable in terms of all relevant LDP policies and where it did not provide residential use on a first floor, developments may be suitable within flood zone 2. To this end, the proposal did not comply with the requirements of TAN 15.

It was recognised that there was full awareness of the economic situation in the countryside and one that was related to agriculture in terms of the seriousness of ensuring economic viability. It was noted that the principle of new development that would contribute towards improving the local economy was fully supported. However, this did not mean that any proposal submitted could be granted, and that proposals must fully comply with the relevant requirements of policies that protect a highly sensitive area such as this from unacceptable new developments.

The officers recommended that the application be refused.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's daughter in law made the following observations:
- The enterprise was not known as a large enterprise for touring caravans nor was it trying to be one
 - They were a local, third generation family caring for the land that had provided a camping service since the 60s and wished to continue to serve future generations
 - Local architects, ecologists and landscape architects had been appointed to prepare the application on their behalf so that it met requirements.
 - They had contacted the Council for suggestions to ensure the application met requirements – it was not a quick, easy or cheap process but they had followed advice
 - It was a small narrow field that was difficult to maintain and fully operate to modern agricultural standards
 - It was a secluded site already well screened, and private. It was neither obvious nor did it negatively impact the quality of the area's recognised national landscape. There was no need for screening as the site was in a natural dip in the land – below road level
 - In order to comply with Council and ecologists' policies, a proposal had been made to plant trees to strengthen the existing hedges
 - That it was intended to use the existing site entrance and therefore no further modifications were needed to the highway

- An agricultural style toilet block was included in the application
- Having touring caravans on site ensured that the land would contribute to the overall productivity of the farm
- Approving the application would benefit the family – in a time of economic uncertainty diversification would give them financial stability
- The proposal would contribute to the wider local economy.

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

- That the farm was 70 acres; it was the third generation of the family that had been farming and milking 50 cows
- Like many farms in Aberdaron (large and small), one common element was that they all diversified with caravan sites
- In 1950 the farm had been granted planning permission to keep caravans; in 1994 permission was obtained for building facilities; permission had been granted for 30 touring units in 1996; this was increased to 39 in 2016.
- Some of the families who stayed there had been returning for 40 years, with some being third generation
- There was no empty pitch on the site –there were 8 families on the waiting list – this was proof that Tir Glyn was an effectively run site with a clear demand for pitches.
- The land was described as 'class 3a land according to Welsh Government maps. 3a lands, are identified as the best and most versatile agricultural land and in this case, it was identified as 'good to moderate quality land'. Although the category was not disputed, this was a thin strip of land located between the main road and Porth Meudwy - grazing was only possible and difficult to handle with large machinery - spreading slurry on it would pose a risk of pollution with a small stream running along the side of the field down to Porth Meudwy.
- If it were good, useful agricultural land, the farmer would not consider it for caravans as it was far too valuable for farming
- Confirming that the Community Council had submitted observations and supported the application - no observations or complaints were received from local, neighbouring residents during the public consultation as the extension would not affect many people
- The site was 1m below the road with a thick, natural thorn 'clawdd' screening the field
- It was disappointing that the officers had asked for more information and that there was a lack of evidence - the applicant was under the impression that all the information had been submitted by the agent
- 'Protect and enhance the natural environment' - the land was at least 1m below the main road and was naturally screened. This was an application asking for 10 units - a neighbour would have the right to let 5 units without a planning application under Caravan Club rules
- 'Impact of losing the best land use' - the farmer probably knew about the quality of the land better than officers? This was a thin strip of land between a road and a cliff. They did not benefit from it as agricultural land and it was therefore perfect for extending the caravan park
- The reference to two entrances was incorrect – one entrance would be used, which was the main entrance to the field; the applicant was willing to completely close off the second entrance or install a fence if half of the field needed to be retained as pasture
- 'Concern about mud and loose material being transported onto the highway and potential for roadside damage to the road verges due to increased traffic' - this was disappointing. A concrete road down to the site that was

very tidy. The main entrance would also be concrete. Concern about road verges being weak – the use was seasonal from March until September.

- The applicant had already donated a piece of land to Cyngor Gwynedd to widen the road and create a passing point – this was directly opposite the entrance, which was now an entrance with a clear splay and views to both sides
- Accepting the observations regarding the lack of drainage response – the applicant was happy to commission a drainage survey and offered a means of imposing a condition for this if it was determined to grant the application.
- The housing crisis had hit the area hard. Wouldn't it be better for visitors to stay in a caravan over the summer months rather than buying a house in the village and leaving it empty for half a year?
- Visitors not only supported the farm – they also contributed and supported the local economy – the local restaurants, butcher and bakery
- That the Pen Draw Llŷn Ward was one of the most rural areas in the County; the position of agriculture was fragile and uncertain and so this was the time for the Council to do everything within its power to support farmers
- The Committee was asked to support the application for the extension of the mobile caravan site for an additional 10 units; 10 units that would be invisible due to the nature of the field which is below the main road and was well screened. 10 units that would be installed on the pitches from March until the end of September with the field returning to grassland over the winter months. This was not Haven or Warren!
- Implored the Committee to support the application and to support a local farming family from Uwchmynydd who were working hard to preserve the farm and to give the next generation a farming future at Tir Glyn.

ch) It was proposed and seconded that the application should be refused in accordance with the recommendation

- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were noted by Members:
- The application was not a complete application - information was missing and it may be possible to visit the site in the future
 - The site was outside the development boundary
 - It was good agricultural land
 - That the Local Member's strong points in supporting farmers need to be considered

In response to a suggestion to defer so that the applicant could submit the information, it was noted that a similar application had been submitted by the applicant two years ago with a recommendation to refuse, but the application had been withdrawn at the last minute by the applicant. It was highlighted that the same reasons for refusal had been listed for that application (apart from drainage requirements which had changed due to national changes), and therefore it was suggested that both the applicant and the agent were aware of the information required.

In response to a suggestion that a site visit should be held, the Assistant Head of Service noted that six reasons for refusal had been listed, and that only one related to visual matters (specifically due to the AONB). The Monitoring Officer reiterated that there were gaps in the information submitted, and until those matters had been recognised, it would be premature to conduct a site visit.

In response to a question about the reasons for refusal, the Assistant Head of Service briefly highlighted the reasons:

- the visual impact on the AONB (would the development be detrimental to the quality of the landscape?)
- a lack of information from the perspective of environmental issues (would there be an impact or not on the nearby Conservation Area?)
- the agricultural aspect of the loss of good agricultural land (although accepting the Local Member's comments)
- the entrance was sub-standard (the Highways Unit was not satisfied with the existing entrance, but accepted the Local Member's comment that a solution was possible, although no information had been received)
- the drainage statement was a new additional requirement
- a flood impact assessment had not been submitted.

He reiterated that the reasons for refusal were matters whereby their impact needed to be fully understood before imposing appropriate conditions. Should visual issues offer themselves as the only reason for refusing the application, then there would be a justification for conducting a site visit. Given that there were five other technical points to be considered as reasons for refusal, there was insufficient basis for conducting a site visit.

RESOLVED: To delegate powers to the Senior Planning Manager to refuse:

- 1. This development would not be in an unobtrusive location that would be completely screened by existing landscape features and landscaping proposals, it would be harmful to the quality of the landscape and it would not integrate appropriately to its location in open countryside. In addition, the proposal would not contribute to the maintenance, enhancement or restoration of the recognised character of the Llŷn Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Policies TWR 5, PCYFF 4 and AMG 1 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan.**
- 2. Insufficient information has been submitted as part of the planning application to enable the Local Planning Authority, as the competent authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended), to undertake an appropriate assessment of the implications of the project for the Pen Llŷn and Sarnau Special Area of Conservation. The proposal therefore does not show that it would protect or improve the natural environment and therefore the application is contrary to the requirements of Policies PS 19 and AMG 5 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026.**
- 3. 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. The proposal therefore is considered to be contrary to the requirements of criteria 6 of Policy PS 6 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan 2011-2026 and advice provided in paragraphs 3.58 and 3.59 of Planning Policy Wales.**
- 4. The proposal as submitted entails the use of a sub-standard entrance and the use of a second entrance without restriction. It is considered that the proposal is unacceptable and contrary to the requirements of policy TRA 4 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan which**

confirms that proposals that would cause unacceptable harm to the safe and efficient operation of the highway will be rejected.

5. No drainage statement has been submitted as part of the application, and therefore insufficient information has been submitted to be able to confirm that the proposal complies with the requirements of part 7 of TAN 15: Development, flooding and coastal erosion (2025) in terms of providing a sustainable drainage system.
6. The site is partially located within a C2 and C3 Flood Zone for surface water and minor watercourses as noted by the 'Flood Map for Planning'. No Assessment of Flood Consequences has been submitted as part of the application and the application means providing a new very vulnerable development on ground floor level and therefore the proposal does not comply with the requirements of paragraphs 6.1, 10.19 or 10.20 of Technical Advice Note 15: Development, flooding and coastal erosion (2025) that ensures that very vulnerable developments are not located within flood zones where they would cause a risk to life.

8. APPLICATION NO C25/0273/04/LL PALE HALL HOTEL, LLANDDERFEL, Y BALA, GWYNEDD, LL23 7PS

Erection of 8 shepherds' huts, installation of foul water receptacle and soakaway and infrastructure to serve the shepherds' huts

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that it was planned to erect 8 shepherds' huts as part of the Palé Hall Hotel business. The number of shepherds' huts from the original proposal had been reduced from 10 to 8 following amendments to the application.

Three shepherds' huts would be located in the northern part of the site closer to the hotel, with a further five located further to the south-west around an existing small lake. It was explained that the site was located within the grounds of the Palé Hall Hotel, a Grade II* listed Victorian country house, approximately 1km from Llanderfel and approximately 5.5km from Bala; the site was outside any development boundary and therefore in open countryside.

In terms of relevant planning restrictions, the location of the site was within the Dyffryn Afon Dyfrdwy Historic Landscape and the Bala Countryside Special Landscape Area; within the catchment area of the Afon Dyfrdwy and Llyn Tegid Special Area of Conservation (SAC); close to the Afon Dyfrdwy Site of Special Scientific Interest, partly within the Wern Dywyll Wildlife Site and the whole site was within the Palé Hall Parkland Tree Preservation Order; part of the site was also within Flood Zones 2 and 3 for surface water and small watercourses on the Flood Map for Planning.

The application was submitted to a committee as the site was larger in size than could be determined by delegated procedure.

In the context of an assessment of the relevant planning considerations, it was noted that the proposed creation of a new permanent alternative camping site within a Special Landscape Area had been considered under Policy TWR 3 of the LDP. It was noted that criterion 1 of policy TWR 3 stated that proposals for such new sites in Special Landscape Areas would be refused, and therefore the proposal was fundamentally contrary to the policy and to the requirements of policy PCYFF 1.

Reference was made to Natural Resources Wales' concerns regarding the potential impact on the Afon Dyfrdwy a Llyn Tegid SACs. Although information had been submitted regarding the foul drainage arrangements, the applicant had not provided hydrogeological evidence or a Groundwater Risk Assessment, as required. As a result, an adverse impact on the SAC could not be ruled out and sufficient information had not been received to enable the Authority to complete an appropriate Assessment.

In the context of flooding and drainage issues, although the site was partly located within Flood Zones 2 and 3, a Flooding Consequences Assessment had not been submitted as part of the application. With the proposal involving development that was a very vulnerable development, it was in breach of the relevant requirements of TAN 15: Development, Flooding and Coastal Erosion. In addition, a Drainage Statement had not been submitted to indicate how surface water would be managed on site and therefore there was insufficient information to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of Part 7 of TAN 15.

It was recognised that some elements of the development were acceptable. The Transport Unit had no objection to the application and the impact of the development on visual amenities, residential amenities and on the setting of the listed building was considered acceptable in this case.

Officers recommended that the Committee refuse the application.

- b) Taking advantage of the opportunity to speak, the Local Member noted that he agreed with the recommendation.
- c) It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused in accordance with the recommendation
- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were noted by Members:
 - The development was too close to the listed building
 - There was a lack of information
 - It was disappointing that there was a recommendation to refuse an initiative that would support existing business and create jobs in the area

In response to a request for clarification for refusal reason 1, namely that 'the proposal would create a new permanent alternative camping site within a Special Landscape Area and therefore contrary to point 1 of policy TWR 3 and PCYFF 1 of the LDP which protects the Special Landscape Area from this type of development', in recognition of the impact of the development on visual amenities, residential amenities and its setting near a listed building were acceptable, it was noted that the application was one for permanent camping accommodation which was therefore contrary to policy.

In response to a supplementary comment that the application was for permanent camping accommodation, but that the shepherds' huts were wheeled and therefore movable, it was noted that the applicant had indicated a proposal to leave the huts on site throughout the year.

RESOLVED: To Refuse

- 1. The proposal would create new permanent alternative camping accommodation within a Special Landscape Area and is therefore contrary to point 1 of policy TWR 3 as well as PCYFF 1 of the Anglesey and Gwynedd Joint Local Development Plan (2011-2026) which protects the Special Landscape Area from this type of development.**
- 2. The test of likely significant impact suggests that there may be a significant impact on the features of the Afon Dyfrdwy and Llyn Tegid SAC, due to the new sewage treatment works proposed and the proximity to the SAC. This means that an Appropriate Assessment is required but insufficient information has been submitted as part of the application for the Local Planning Authority to be able 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 or the requirements of policies PS19 and AMG 5 of the Joint LDP or chapter 6 of PPW that deals with green infrastructure, net benefit to biodiversity, the protection given to Sites of Special Scientific Interest and trees and woodlands.**
- 3. The site is partly located within Flood Zones 2 and 3 for surface water and small watercourses as set out in the 'Flood Map for Planning'. No Assessment of Flood Consequences has been submitted as part of the application and the application means providing a new very vulnerable development on ground floor level and therefore the proposal does not comply with the requirements of paragraphs 6.1, 10.19 or 10.20 of Technical Advice Note 15: Development, flooding and coastal erosion (2025) that ensures that very vulnerable developments are not located within flood zones where they would cause a risk to life.**
- 4. No drainage statement has been submitted as part of the application, and therefore insufficient information has been submitted to be able to confirm that the proposal complies with the requirements of part 7 of TAN 15: Development, flooding and coastal erosion (2025) in terms of providing a sustainable drainage system.**

The meeting commenced at 1.00 pm and concluded at 2.45 pm

CHAIRMAN