

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 6/11/17

---

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

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

**Others invited:** Councillors Aled Ll. Evans, Gareth W. Griffith, Elwyn Jones, Kevin Morris Jones and Elfed Wyn Williams (Local Members).

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Planning Manager), A. Rhys Roberts (Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Development Control Officer - Transport), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Bethan Adams (Member Support Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillor Stephen Churchman.

### 1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

- (a) Councillors Anne Lloyd Jones and Berwyn Parry Jones declared a personal interest in item 5.4 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0565/41/LL) because they were members of the Board of Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd.

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

- (b) The following members stated that they were local members in relation to the items noted:
- Councillor Elfed Wyn Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 on the agenda (planning application number C16/0367/18/LL);
  - Councillor Elwyn Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee) in relation to item 5.2 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0440/18/AM).
  - Councillor Gareth W. Griffith (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.3 on the agenda (planning application number C16/0507/20/LL);
  - Councillor Aled Ll. Evans (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda, (planning application number C17/0565/41/LL);
  - Councillor Simon Glyn (member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.5 and 5.8 on the agenda, (planning application numbers C17/0669/46/LL and C17/0859/46/LL);
  - Councillor Kevin Morris Jones, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.7 on the agenda (planning application number C17/0807/15/LL).

The Members withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussion on the applications in question and did not vote on these matters.

### 2. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 16 October 2017, as a true record.

### 3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

Details of the applications were expanded upon and questions were answered in relation to the plans and aspects of the policies.

#### RESOLVED

#### 1. Application number C16/0367/18/LL - Land near Capel Maes y Dref, Clwt y Bont, Deiniolen

Full application to construct 12 houses and create an entrance and estate road.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application had been deferred at the meeting of the Committee held on 13 March 2017 in order for the applicant to submit further information regarding the drainage plan and to receive further details about why it was not possible to include a play area within the application site. It was reported that the information regarding the drainage plans has been received but no further information had been received, justifying why a play area could not be included as part of the planning application.

When the application had been submitted before the Committee in March, it had been explained that the site was within the development boundary and had been designated for housing under the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan (GUDP). However, in July 2017, the GUDP had been superseded by the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan (JLDP), and the site was no longer located within the development boundary, although it did abut it.

It was noted that despite the fact that 4 of the 12 houses were affordable, it was not considered that the application now conformed to the existing planning policies as the site as a whole was located outside of the development boundary as included in the JLDP, that the proposal did not show that its location in the countryside was essential and the proposal was not for 100% affordable housing, therefore, the application in its present form would not be acceptable in principle.

Having considered the above and all the relevant matters including the local and national policies and guidance, as well as all the observations/objections received, it was not believed that this proposal, in its current form, was acceptable in principle and that it was contrary to the requirements of the relevant policies as noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application, noting that there were flooding risks, there was no need for housing in the area and that the site was outside the development boundary.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

A member asked whether the officers would be supportive of the application if all the houses were affordable. In response, the Planning Manager noted that details would need to be assessed should such an application be submitted.

A member noted that she would be voting to refuse the application due to the flooding risk.

#### **RESOLVED to refuse the application.**

Reason:

The proposal was unacceptable on the basis of principle and was contrary to the requirements of Policy PCYFF1 (development boundaries), TAI3 (houses in service villages) and TAI16 (exception sites) of the Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan and to Technical Advice Note 6 on Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities along with Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 9 Housing as it involved erecting new houses in the countryside and outside the development boundaries of Deiniolen without justification.

## 2. Application number C17/0440/18/AM - Land adjacent to Gorswen, Brynrefail

Outline application, with some reserved matters, for constructing eight affordable houses (one set of semi-detached houses and two terraces of three) along with modifications to an existing access, parking spaces, road to the estate and gardens for the individual houses

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 16 October 2017 in order to hold a site visit. Some members had visited the site prior to the meeting.

It was reported that some issues had arisen following the previous meeting. Firstly, in light of the observations of Natural Resources Wales (NRW), the applicant had submitted a pollution risk assessment from appropriate experts who came to the conclusion that the site was suitable for the development but were recommending more detailed inspections before providing the infrastructure. It was noted that NRW and the Public Protection Unit had been consulted on the content of the report, but no response has been received thus far. Attention was drawn to the fact that these bodies had already stated their satisfaction for the development to go ahead, subject to appropriate conditions, therefore no new objections were anticipated, but there would possibly be some comments on the methods of operation.

Secondly, a response had been received from the Joint Planning Policy Unit to the Community and Language Statement, noting that whilst considering the importance of ensuring appropriate provision of affordable housing within the County, the development would be likely to offer an opportunity to keep the population local in their community and, in doing so, it could have a positive impact on the Welsh Language.

It was noted that the matter had been raised at the previous meeting regarding open space provision on the site, it was confirmed that the JLDP included a threshold of 10 units, where it was required for developers to make a specific provision. Attention was drawn to the fact that the site was approximately 50 yards from the village's main playing field and therefore it was considered that there was sufficient open spaces for the residents of these houses.

Attention was drawn to the fact that confirmation had been received, prior to the previous meeting of the Committee, that Llanddeiniolen Community Council were supportive of the plan.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (not a Member of this Planning Committee), objected, noting the following main points:
- That nearby residents objected to the proposal;
  - Acknowledged that there was a decrease from 12 to 8 houses from the previous application, but of the opinion that it was still an overdevelopment of the site;
  - Approving the development on a site outside the development boundary would be contrary to the JLDP;
  - Questioned the need and whether the houses would be affordable;

- Concerns regarding road safety - there would be an increase in traffic as a result of the development, with recent accidents between cars, and collisions with children in the past;
- A discussion was needed between the Council, the developer and residents in terms of the best use of the site.

(c) In response to the local member's observations, the officers noted:

- There was no doubt about the need for this type of housing. The Strategic Housing Unit had confirmed the need, and Grŵp Cynefin had declared an interest in developing housing on the site;
- The proposal was not contrary to the JLDP;
- The Transportation Unit would not hold records of collisions between cars, it was a matter for the Police. In terms of car collisions with children, the Transportation Unit had no record of any incidents. The development was self-contained with good access therefore the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal.

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

During the ensuing discussion, the following main points were noted by members:

- Concern in terms of the need for four bedroom housing;
- That it was important to listen to the local opinion in terms of the land being polluted;
- Concern in terms of access and road safety;
- Concern in terms of flooding risk;
- That the proposal led to an overdevelopment of the site;
- The application for affordable housing was welcomed, and that there was a need for more social housing;
- Consideration should be given to changing the road to be one-way, or to include a footpath to improve the situation in terms of road safety;
- That there was a need to listen to the opinion of the local member, and that the member would vote against approving the application;
- Concern that the housing would not be affordable;
- It was a shame that members were intending to vote against approving the application that would provide affordable housing for local people;
- The opinion of the Senior Development Control Officer - Transport should be accepted, namely that the proposal was in accordance with the guidance;
- That the site was outside the development boundary;
- Were the houses in addition to the number noted in the JLDP?
- It would be a mistake to refuse the application - did not want to accept costs against the Council as a result of an appeal;
- The need had been proved and the proposal would enable young families to stay in the area.

(d) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:

- That evidence showed that there was a need for this type of housing and that 100% of the housing were affordable;
- The affordability of the housing could be controlled through a 106 Agreement which would ensure that the development complied with the requirements of affordable housing;
- That the Senior Development Control Officer - Transport had confirmed that the proposal was acceptable in terms of highways. Considerable weight should be given to the officer's opinion, therefore should the application be refused based on road safety, then the application would be referred to a cooling-off period.

- That professional expert information had been brought forward regarding road safety, therefore should the application be refused on this basis, there would be a significant risk for the Council in terms of an appeal;
- That Policy TAI 16 of the JLDP allowed, as an exception, the development of housing schemes that were 100% affordable on sites that were directly adjacent to a development boundary and which formed a reasonable extension to the village boundary.
- The application would contribute towards the need for housing which had been identified within the JLDP.

**RESOLVED to delegate the power to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application subject to relevant legal obligations related to ensuring that the eight houses are affordable for general local need, receiving a confirmation from Natural Resources Wales and the Public Protection Service that the pollution risk management report is acceptable, and the relevant planning conditions involving:**

1. The commencement of the development and submission of reserved matters
2. All materials to be agreed
3. Slate roofs
4. The site lay-out plan to be submitted and agreed
5. Welsh Water Condition
6. An Invasive Species Eradication Plan to be submitted, agreed and implemented
7. A landscaping and tree planting plan to be submitted, agreed and implemented including details of which trees were to be protected, how these trees will be protected during the development, and management of these features in the long term
8. Pollution risk management conditions
9. No site clearance work during the bird nesting season
10. Highway conditions
11. Withdrawal of permitted development rights.

Notes:

Welsh Water

Natural Resources Wales

Highways

**3. Application number C16/0507/20/LL - Offices of Menai Marina, Old Slate Quay, Felinheli**

Construction of two-storey extension to existing office to provide toilets, showers and more office space together with the construction of three retail units (A1) and extending the current car park.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the design and access statement explained that the building would facilitate natural supervision in a central location between the port to the south west and the port system to the east. It was also intended to operate the port gates from the building. The building would also provide new facilities including toilets and showers in a central location for marina users.

Attention was drawn to the fact that ownership had been changed since submitting the application. A letter had been received from the new owner stating his intention to continue with the application.

It was noted that the application site was entirely within the Felinheli development boundary. It was added that the application site also made use of previously developed land and that this was encouraged through Planning Policy Wales and the JLDP.

A number of observations had been received objecting on the grounds that the building was a dominant development, which was too big and would have a negative impact on the character of the marina which included listed buildings. On the other hand, observations had been received in favour of the development which acknowledged that the proposal would offer a visual improvement to the area by getting rid of the mobile cabins and the area would be much more attractive.

It was noted that in assessing the location, height and bulk of nearby buildings that included three-storey houses, a block of flats and a substantial hotel in the context of the natural level of the landscape, it was not considered that the development would be a dominant structure or that it was too big for the site. It was also considered that the design and the materials were acceptable to the location. It was also not considered that the development would be harmful to the setting of the nearby listed buildings. It was considered that it was reasonable and necessary to impose a condition and to ensure that the retail units were not constructed without the offices to ensure a satisfactory appearance to the development and to protect the area's visual amenities.

It was considered that the impacts associated with offices, amenity facilities and small retail units could be acceptable close to residential houses, especially given the current land use. To protect the residential amenities of the nearby houses, it was considered reasonable to restrict the shops' opening hours to between 8am and 8pm every day and also to prevent deliveries outside of these hours.

The application was accompanied by a flood consequence assessment and Natural Resources Wales had confirmed that potential consequences could be managed sufficiently on this site provided that conditions were imposed in relation to the finished floor level of the retail units, incorporating flood damage prevention measures in the existing building and its extension and reaching agreement on and the implementation of flooding action plan.

It was noted that the plans showed an intention to extend the car park in order to serve the development. The Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal based on imposing a condition which prevented the use of the car park as a boat storage area. A high number of objections were received on grounds of parking issues and problems which already existed in the area and the effect of the proposed development on this.

Following further discussions, observations were received from the new owner, stating that there would be no objection to imposing a condition to prevent the car park from being used to store boats. It was also considered appropriate to ensure that the car park would be available for customers of the new shops together with users of the marina by condition. It was considered that imposing such a condition could offer improvements to the area as there was currently no control over the car park and the condition should reduce the need for boat owners to park on the side of the road by keeping the car park for cars only.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:-
- That he was the Chair of a Committee of most residents of the Old Slate Quay;
  - Any new development would lead to an overdevelopment of the site;
  - That the local member and the Community Council were supportive of the objection;
  - The report did not give consideration to the planning application approved in 2010, although it had not been developed, it would be in the near future;
  - The development would affect the area's character;
  - That parking issues already existed in the area.

- (c) The following main points were made by the local member (not a member of this Planning Committee):
- That there were already associated facilities on the site, but that the previous owner had leased them out;
  - Impact on parking and transport, problems in this area already;
  - That it was misleading in terms of the car park; it was used to keep boats. Where would the boats be kept should a condition be imposed preventing them from being kept there?
  - That large buildings were taking over the area;
  - That there was a need to consider the 87 houses that would be impacted by the development;
  - He asked the Committee to consider refusing the application.
- (ch) In response to the above observations, the Planning Manager noted:
- The Community Council had not objected but they had offered observations as noted in the report;
  - That there had been a change in ownership and the original associated facilities were not available for users therefore consideration could not be given to them. The proposed associated facilities were located in a prominent and better place for users;
  - It was considered that the proposal was not an overdevelopment of the site.
  - That the condition clearly prevented the car park from being used to store boats. Should there be a need to move a boat from the water on a crane, it was possible to keep the car park clear for the relevant period. The applicant could be asked for more information if there was a wish to do so.

It was proposed to refuse the application contrary to the officers' recommendation as it was an overdevelopment of the site, the proposal would add to the current parking and transport problems, the impact on listed buildings and the impact on the amenities of local residents. The proposal was seconded.

The Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the planners' role was to assess applications and all of the information received, and to present a robust recommendation. He noted that consideration had been given to local observations. He suggested that consideration should be given to holding a site visit as the main concern was the size of the development. He noted that it would be extremely difficult to justify refusing on the grounds of parking and transport issues, considering the Transportation Unit's observations. In terms of issues relating to design, the development's size, the visual impact and the impact on nearby listed buildings, these may be considered on the site before reaching a decision. It was noted that, in the meantime, it would be possible to ask the applicant to confirm practical details in terms of moving the boats.

An amendment was proposed to hold a site visit, to ask the applicant for further information in terms of the situation with the current associated facilities, as well as confirmation of the use of the car park and how it was intended to move the boats from the dock to the land in future. The amendment was seconded.

**RESOLVED to hold a site visit, to ask the applicant for further information in terms of the situation with the current associated facilities, as well as confirmation of the use of the car park and how it is intended to move the boats from the dock to the land in future.**

#### **4. Application number C17/0565/41/LL - Land near Bro Sion Wyn, Chwilog**

The discussion on this application was chaired by the Vice-chair.

An application to erect an open market two-storey dwelling.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the proposal involved constructing a new house on land within the development boundary and within a residential area in the village of Chwillog.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.

It was noted that the proposed house would be located on a site which was parallel to the public road and was relatively close to existing housing. It was acknowledged that windows were on the gable ends of the proposed building where they would look towards the existing housing, but there was a distance of approximately 17 metres between the gable ends and the nearest houses, with a county road also running past one side. It was felt that the impact of overlooking on these houses would not be substantial or cause disruption to an unacceptable degree.

The original observations of the Transportation Unit had been received noting a concern regarding the parking and turning arrangements within the curtilage. It was noted following receiving a further plan by the agent showing an amendment to the parking layout and access for the proposal in addition to a reduction from four to three in the number of bedrooms, that the Transportation Unit confirmed that the amended details were acceptable. It was realised that an objection has been raised in terms of road safety and the impact on existing parking arrangements. However, the Transportation Unit did not object to the proposal, and therefore it was not considered that the amended proposal was contrary to policy TRA 2 and TRA 4 of the JLDP.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:
- Astonishment that Cartrefi Cymunedol Gwynedd (CCG) used architects that were not local;
  - Disappointment if the site was sold on the open market - the money would go towards constructing other affordable housing within the County at the expense of Bro Sion Wyn residents.
  - Parking issues existed on the estate and the development would not help the situation;
  - The development would impact the amenities of the estate's residents;
  - The proposal led to the loss of a green space;
  - Requested that the Committee to go against the officers' recommendation because it was a matter of opinion and not policy in terms of what impacted people's amenities.

- (c) A proposal to undertake a site visit was made and seconded.

A member noted that confirmation was needed as to CCG's arrangements to sell the site, considering the parking issues that existed on the estate.

In response, the Senior Solicitor noted that consideration could be given to the parking situation but that the applicant's intention to sell the site was not relevant to the planning application and that it was a matter to be considered in another forum.

**RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.**

**5. Application number C17/0669/46/LL – Fferm Pwll Goed, Tudweiliog, Pwllheli**

Creation of a touring caravan site for nine units.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the proposal comprised using the site of five caravans under a Camping and Caravanning Club exemption certificate as an independent site to locate nine touring caravans. It was noted that the site was within the Special Landscape Area and the Llŷn and Bardsey Island Landscape of Outstanding Historical Interest.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the Community Council supported the proposal and that the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Unit (AONB) had confirmed that the proposal would not impact the AONB.

It was confirmed that there would be no need to undertake adaptations to the access in order to serve the proposal.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The application was supported by the local member (a member of this Planning Committee); he noted that the applicant was maintaining the current site to a standard, the site was completely hidden and was not prominent in the landscape.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with submitted plans.
3. The number of units on the site at any one time to be restricted to nine.
4. Restrict the season to between 1 March and 31 October.
5. Holiday use only.
6. A register to be maintained.
7. No storing of touring caravans on the site.
8. Carry out the landscaping plan.

**6. Application number C17/0678/30/LL - Tŷ Canol Pencaerau, Rhiw, Pwllheli**

Establish a glamping site for six units and erect a shed.

- (a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that it was to establish a glamping site for six units. The application also included a proposal to erect a shed that would be used to keep furniture and various machines and store some of the pods during the winter months.

It was noted that it was considered that the design, layout and appearance of the proposal were acceptable and they would not cause substantial harm to the visual quality of the landscape.

It was believed that the proposal was acceptable based on the matters noted in the report and that it would not have a substantial impact on the Special Landscape Area, amenities of the neighbourhood or road safety.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

## Conditions:

1. Commencement within five years.
2. In accordance with submitted plans.
3. The number of units on the site at any one time to be restricted to 6.
4. Restrict the season to between 1 March and 31 October.
5. Holiday use only.
6. A register to be maintained.
7. The pods to be stored in or near the shed as shown on the plans during the periods when the site would be closed.
8. External walls and roof of the shed to be dark green in colour BS 12 C 39.
9. Carry out the landscaping plan.

**7. Application number C17/0807/15/LL - Land near Tŷ Du Road, Llanberis, Caernarfon.**

Amend condition 1 of planning permission C14/0240/15/MG to approve an alternative design for the approved housing

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, emphasising that the design of the 11 houses had already been approved in addition to minor amendments to the formation within the site in question. It was noted that the principle of the development had already been accepted and planning permission had been approved and secured by commencing the work within the necessary period.

It was noted that the proposal was to change the design of the houses to a more modern design by dividing the houses' roofs, creating two slopes on different levels and to remove the integrated garages that were part of the original design, and to have carports for vehicles. It was explained that it was intended to keep the housing within the same previously agreed plots with all houses being two-storeys. The new houses would have significant elements of glass in the front and rear elevations with the use of stone, render and timber cladding on the external walls.

There had been some minor changes to the site's internal layout, including the access arrangement from the Fron Goch road where only one vehicular access would serve one of the new houses, rather than two accesses which was previously agreed.

It was believed that the proposed new design was more modern and less substantial, creating a more open atmosphere for the estate.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector noted the following main points:
- If the Fron Goch residents would be prevented from parking where they currently park, they would have no place to park;
  - Hopefully, the developer had not felled any protected trees, and the objector asked who was keeping an eye on the trees;
  - The Council had noted in a letter that they would work with residents in terms of a parking solution. When would this happen?
- (c) Taking advantage of the opportunity to speak, the applicant noted the following points:-
- That this was an application to change the design only;

- The original design of the housing was standard, and consideration had not been given to the location. The design had been amended by using materials that were in keeping with the local area;
- The housing density had decreased, removing a bedroom from above the garage;
- Access to one of the houses had been changed to be within the site rather than from Fron Goch, reducing the number of houses with access from Fron Goch;
- There were a number of objections that were irrelevant matters to this application;
- They hoped to create additional parking spaces within the site application for local residents after completing the development.

(ch) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), objected, noting the following main points:

- The design was not in-keeping and was out of character with the village;
- Astonishment that work had already commenced on the site, before receiving a decision on the application;
- The developer did not give consideration to the environment and that it appeared that the Council had not discussed breach of conditions with the company;
- The design was being changed to reduce the cost for the developer;
- Soil had recently gone into the river and the lake, causing pollution. Natural Resources Wales had put measures in force;
- Flood risks to nearby streets deriving from the proposal;
- That he assumed that the houses would be too expensive for local people, therefore they were likely to become holiday homes. There was a need for housing for local people in Llanberis.

(d) In response to the above observations, the Planning Manager noted that a planning permission was in place and that this permission was currently being implemented. She emphasised that this application was for a change in design and to change the access to protect tree roots. She noted that officers were monitoring activities on the site but that these matters were not relevant to this application.

A proposal to undertake a site visit was made and seconded.

A member asked the officers to include comparative information in terms of the original application in the follow-up report to the Committee.

**RESOLVED to undertake a site visit.**

## **8. Application number C17/0859/46/LL – Ty'n Llan Caravan Park, Tudweiliog, Pwllheli**

Extend an existing static caravan site, increase the numbers from 31 to 40 and create a play / recreation area and landscaping.

(a) The Planning Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that Policy TWR 3 of the JLDP did not permit an increase in the number of static caravans at existing sites within the Special Landscape Area. In addition, it was not considered that extending the site would improve its setting in the surrounding landscape and it would not maintain, improve or restore the character of the Special Landscape Area.

Observations on the application had been received from the Transportation Unit and they had voiced concerns about the entrance, especially in terms of visibility when leaving the site. The observations stated that visibility to the south included a visibility splay of a reasonable length; however, it was noted that vehicles parked here regularly and impeded the view of the road. The situation to the northern side was no better, with a high boundary wall severely restricting visibility. Considering the restrictions on visibility on both sides of

the access, it was believed that the increase in the number of units from 31 to 40 units, an increase of approximately 30%, was significant and unacceptable unless improvements were made to the access.

- (b) The Local Member (a member of this committee) noted that the site was tidy and was being maintained to a standard. He asked the Committee to consider deferring the application in order for the applicant to withdraw the application and hold discussions with the Caravans Officer and the Planning Officers in order to submit an application that would address health and safety issues on the site.
- (c) In response to a question from a member, the Senior Solicitor noted that it was not inappropriate to defer the application in order to seek a better understanding. He added that it would be better to defer rather than to refuse the application.

**RESOLVED to defer the application.**

**9. Application number C17/0862/25/LL - Land near Capel Bethmaaca, Glasinfryn, Bangor**

Construction of two semi-detached dwellings and associated works.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the two houses were intended to be affordable for the needs of the local community. It was noted that the site was located within the Glasinfryn cluster, as defined in the JLDP, between two buildings which had been highlighted in red on the inset map which formed part of the JLDP.

Attention was drawn to the fact that planning permission had already been approved to develop an affordable house on this site in 2015 under reference C15/0143/25/LL.

It was noted that the Strategic Housing Unit had confirmed that the plan would meet the need in the area.

It was acknowledged that there would be some overshadowing to the rear garden of the property next door, but this was not considered unusual in a residential area and it was not believed that it would cause significant harm. It was not considered that the new building was likely to cause overlooking of the neighbour's property as there would be no windows in the northern elevation of the new building.

The development was acceptable in terms of relevant local and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

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

In response to a member's question regarding the inclusion of a condition to ensure that there would be Welsh names for the houses, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that, legally, a condition could not be imposed to this end, but a note could be added to suggest giving the houses Welsh names.

**RESOLVED to delegate the power to the Senior Planning Manager to approve the application subject to relevant legal obligations related to ensuring that the two houses are affordable for general local need and material planning conditions involving:**

1. The commencement time of the development;
2. Development in strict accordance with the plans

3. Slate roof
4. Welsh Water Condition
5. Biodiversity Condition
6. Highways Condition
7. Withdrawal of permitted development rights.

Notes:

Welsh Water.

A Welsh name for the houses

The meeting commenced at 1.00pm and concluded at 3.00pm.

---

**CHAIR**