

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 11/01/16

---

**Present:** Councillor Michael Sol Owen – Chair  
Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones – Vice-chair

**Councillors:** Elwyn Edwards, Simon Glyn, Gwen Griffith, Eric Merfyn Jones, June Marshall, W. Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams, John Wyn Williams (substitute), Owain Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Others invited:** Councillor E. Selwyn Griffiths.

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Keira Sweenie (Senior Development Control Officer), Medi Emlyn Davies (Development Control Officer), Gareth Roberts (Senior Transportation Development Control Officer), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Glynda O'Brien (Member Support and Scrutiny Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillors Dyfrig Jones and Peter Read (local member).

### 1. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

(a) The following members declared a personal interest for the reasons noted:-

- Councillor Owain Williams in item 5 on the agenda - Planning Applications (Planning Application No. C15/1072/34/LL) as he was the former owner of the site.
- Councillor Gruffydd Williams in Item 5 on the agenda - Planning Applications (Planning Application No. C15/1072/34/LL) as he was the son of the former owner of the site.

The Members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests, and they withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the applications noted.

(b) The following members declared that they were local members in relation to the items noted:

- Councillor John Wyn Williams (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.4 on the agenda (planning application number C15/1115/25/LL);
- Councillor E. Selwyn Griffiths (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.5 and 5.6 on the agenda, (planning applications number C15/1128/44/LL and C15/1181/44/LL);
- Councillor Gwen Griffith (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to items 5.7 and 5.9 on the agenda (planning applications C15/0348/16/LL and C15/1208/16/LL);
- Councillor Simon Glyn (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.8 on the agenda (planning application C15/1139/46/LL)

The members withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussions 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 30 November 2015, 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 C15/0215/40/LL - Land near Tan yr Eglwys, Abererch

Erect nine new houses which would include 3 affordable dwellings together with forming an internal access road and a pedestrian route.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the proposed houses were within the development boundary of Abererch and that the site had been allocated for new houses within the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan. The site could cope with approximately nine residential units, with approximately 35% of those being affordable houses. It was explained that the houses would be a mixture of single-storey and two-storey houses, with two parking spaces within their curtilages.

It was noted that a terrace of houses to the north of the site had been registered as listed buildings. Attention was drawn to the fact that a public footpath ran through part of the site and that the proposal would impact the route's course and because of this, its formal diversion would have to be arranged. It was further noted that part of the site to the east was located within a C1 flood zone.

Reference was made to the relevant planning policies together with the response to the public consultations as outlined in the report.

In the context of linguistic matters, a community statement had not been received from the applicant as of yet but should it be approved and if it was acceptable it could be considered that the proposal was in line with policy A2 of the GUDP.

The planning officers had expressed concern regarding the layout of the two-storey houses on the lowest boundary as they would be oppressive and would dominate the Pen y Don property. Despite changes to the plans, the officers had remained concerned about plots 4-7 and had recommended that it would be better to look at the layout of the entire site to see if two-storey houses would be better located on another part of the site. A supportive statement was submitted from the agent explaining that the layout had been created in this way to avoid impact on the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings.

Although there was no objection to the number of houses, it was considered that it would be possible to have an improved layout for the two-storey houses and therefore the officers were of the opinion that the proposal did not comply with the brief and the criteria of policies CH1 or B22 as the layout did not respect the site in terms of scale and size and was likely to have an impact on nearby properties. It was also noted that the proposed landscaping was insufficient as the fences were unsuitable as a method of enclosing the site and would be contrary to relevant policies.

It was noted that transportation, footpaths, floods, surface water and biodiversity matters were acceptable through appropriate conditions. The officers came to the conclusion that the proposed plan as submitted was contrary to policies CH1 and B22 due to its setting and visual impact, B27 due to the unsuitable fences, and B23 due to the impact on amenities. Because of this, the planning officers' recommendation was to refuse the application for these reasons.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- the applicant had not received a request for a community statement until 22 December although the planning application had been registered in March 2015 and therefore this was not a sufficient amount of time to submit it prior to this Planning Committee
  - in terms of impact on Pen y Don, it was explained that the rear of the Pen y Don property backed onto the site
  - the importance to have a mixture of houses on the site and that the ideal location for two-storey houses was the lowest part of the site
  - in terms of a fence, it was confirmed that the developer was more than happy to change the fence to a stone wall and that it would be possible to comply with this by imposing a condition on the planning permission should the Committee consider approving the application
  - it would be valuable for the Planning Committee to visit the site so that they could see for themselves and gain an understanding of the locations of the mixture of houses in terms of size, etc.
- (c) In response to the above, the Senior Planning Service Manager explained that the Officers' concerns were highlighted in the objections that had been received regarding visual matters in terms of scale and residential amenity matters and it was agreed that a site visit would be a way forward so that the Planning Committee could consider these matters.
- (ch) During the discussion, the following main observations were made:
- No difficulty was foreseen with the application and that the development did not have an excessive impact, but the concerns were understood
  - Importance of taking flood matters into consideration

It was proposed and seconded to visit the site.

**RESOLVED: To organise that the Planning committee visits the site.**

## **2. Application no. C15/1072/34/LL – Erw Wen, Llanllyfni**

Retrospective application for the erection of a row of solar panels in a field.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the domestic solar panels had been installed in their place. The site was situated in open countryside between Tai'n Lon and Nasareth and was within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. It was noted that the area of the panels measured approximately 66m square, and measured 22m by 3.3m in height and generated 10kw of power. It was noted that the purpose of retrospective applications was to control the development and refer to national policy which clearly stated that the situation should be

rectified but not by punishing the individual that was breaking the rules, and that the application should be considered on its own merits.

Reference was made to the relevant planning policies together with the response to the public consultations within the report. No objection had been received to the application.

The application's main consideration was the development's visual impact on the AONB and late observations had been received from the AONB Unit stating that as the development was small and although it was visible from some nearby locations, it was not considered that it unacceptably impacted the AONB, but perhaps it would be beneficial to plant more trees to screen the development from the public footpath.

With relevant conditions to ensure that the cables were underground, it was considered that the application was acceptable and conformed to relevant planning policies. The report's content had acknowledged the impact on users of the public footpath and the planning officers were of the opinion that it was acceptable and would only impact a very small part of the path and therefore no landscaping conditions were necessary. It was recommended to approve the application in line with the conditions outlined in the report.

(b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following main points:-

- That the development formed part of continuous improvements to Erw Wen
- When the property had been purchased, it had one of the worst scores in terms of energy performance and environmental impact rating, and by now the performance score had arisen and conformed with the Welsh Government's environmental requirements for 2020.
- The location of the solar panels was important in terms of complying with local government guidelines together with balancing the needs of the environment and the area
- The setting of the panels almost reflected the angle of the hill and that they had been placed in a very low location in the field
- The lowest part of the field together with the mature trees had a natural bowl effect when screening the panels from the north, the east and the west. To the south, there were two rows of trees which created the least possible visibility of the panels
- It was intended to plant trees in the lowest part of the field between the panels and the property's courtyard as well as planting hedges on the boundary of the footpath
- There would be no change to the use of the land and livestock would be able to graze along the boundary fence
- The proposal was a small domestic one which would allow any leftover energy to be returned to the national grid for the benefit of others

(c) The Committee was reminded that the Local Member had declared an interest and had left the Chamber during the discussion on the application.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

(ch) During the discussion, a Member noted his wish to impose a condition involving de-commissioning and the planning officer agreed to this.

**Resolved: To approve the application in accordance with the following conditions together with a de-commissioning condition as outlined in (ch) above:**

**1. To complete the development in accordance with the plans**

**2. Any cable link from the panels would have to be underground or as otherwise agreed with the LPA beforehand.**

**3. De-commissioning**

**3. Application number C15/1109/08/LL - Bwthyn Bach Gwyn, Pant, Penrhydeudraeth**

Partly retrospective application for the adaptation of a house's outbuilding.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the application for the conversion of a two-storey building which had previously been an agricultural building on the outskirts of the town of Penrhydeudraeth into a two-storey dwelling. An off-street parking space would be provided at the front of the building. It was noted that the work of converting the building had already commenced, and the application had been submitted following action from the Planning Service's Enforcement Unit.

It was noted that the site was in the middle of a residential area, within a Landscape Conservation Area and within the development boundary of Penrhydeudraeth.

Reference was made to the relevant planning policies together with the response / objections to the public consultations within the report.

Attention was drawn to the main policies when assessing the application, namely C4 and CH11, and it was believed that the alterations that had already been undertaken conformed to the requirements of the above policies.

Objections had been received which noted that the external alterations had impacted the area's character. However, several amendments had historically been made to the building, and it was considered that the property had already lost a lot of its character. It was noted that re-using the building offered its renovation, its safeguarding and prevention from further deterioration. It was considered that the business use rather than the previous use would be an improvement and would have less impact in terms of disturbance and noise. Attention was drawn to the fact that the building had been located far enough from other houses to ensure that there would be no impact on the privacy of nearby properties.

It was confirmed that transportation and biodiversity matters were acceptable.

It was considered that the development of a new house on this site is acceptable and it was not considered that it would have an adversely harmful impact on the area's amenities or on neighbouring residents. Furthermore, it was considered that the location, design, finish and form of the development was acceptable and was in keeping with the context of its location. Therefore, it was recommended to approve the application in line with the relevant conditions as outlined in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- When the owner had purchased the property he was under the impression from the description that it was a high-quality house
  - That the construction work had commenced, the work had been stopped and a planning application had been submitted.
  - The intention was to use an old building which had deteriorated
  - Although some negative observations had been received, these were irrelevant to planning matters, for example one referred to the fact that the walls had been

plastered but attention was drawn to the fact that most houses in the proximity had been plastered and painted

- The site was mainly surrounded by dwellings and the property was served by an unclassified road
- An outline application for a new house opposite the site had been approved in October 2015
- The site had been located within the development boundary of Penrhyndeudraeth and the planning officers had been supportive of the application
- The application complied with the relevant planning policies and an appeal was made to the Committee to consider the application favourably and to approve it

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

(ch) During the discussion, the following main observations were made by individual Members:

- Concern regarding the owner's misunderstanding regarding the original quality and use of the building
- Concern that individuals could purchase ruins, restore them and convert them into dwellings
- It was suggested that it would be better to ask the Planning Committee to visit the site
- Penrhyndeudraeth Town Council had objected to the application due to an over-development in this part of the town, and that their observations should be taken into consideration
- That some retrospective applications had been previously refused which had meant that the individual had to demolish buildings
- No parking spaces

(d) In response to the above observations, the Senior Planning Services Manager explained :-

- While he shared concerns in terms of ruins in rural areas, he drew attention to the fact that this building was within the development boundary and followed the footprint of the existing building.
- While he accepted that the owner had misunderstood in terms of the original house's legal use, the application submitted had to be dealt with and it was emphasised that it complied with relevant planning policies.
- It was not an overdevelopment given the dispersed nature of the nearby houses.
- It was required to consider each retrospective application on its own merit.
- There was provision of parking spaces in front of the house

**Resolved: To approve with the following conditions:**

**Work in accordance with the submitted plans**

**Finishes of external walls to be agreed**

**Slates on the roof**

**Water drainage conditions**

**Withdrawal of permitted development rights for extensions and curtilage buildings.**

#### **4. Application no. C15/1115/25/LL – Goetre Uchaf, Off Penrhos Road, Bangor**

Part re-plan to 174 residential dwellings at existing approved development (Ref:C12/1347/25/LL) by way of increasing the overall number of dwellings from 245 to

266, comprising detached, semi-detached and apartments to include affordable units (35%) with associated parking and garden areas.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that this was an amendment to the existing permission to increase the number of houses on-site from 245 to 266, namely 21 additional houses by way of providing more one and two bedroom units. It was emphasised that the plan did not involve expanding the site or amending the internal roads layout within the site. Attention was drawn to the fact that the original permission had been implemented, and the work continued on the site with 50 of the houses already occupied. The application was submitted in response to a change in the housing market since the original application was permitted, with the intention of providing two-storey houses and flats.

The Committee's attention was drawn to point 1.6 of the report which referred to an appeal which was ongoing on the site. Despite the appeal, it was noted that this application had been submitted to provide additional necessary information on the previous application with the hope of avoiding an appeal should planning permission be granted prior to the date of the appeal. However, full consideration had to be given to the application submitted and it needed to be considered on its own merits.

The site was located within the development boundary of the city of Bangor which had been specifically allocated for residential development. Reference was made to the relevant policies together with the responses received to the consultations. Two additional letters of objection had been received since providing the report and they had been noted.

It was noted that the principle of establishing the houses had already been approved in the original permission and the site had been allocated for housing in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, and the development brief noted that the site could cope with 270 residential units based on the development density of 30 units per hectare. Attention was drawn to the fact that the application in question better contributed to the Council's housing targets than the existing permission and because of this, the planning officers were of the opinion that the number of units proposed as part of the application was acceptable.

The previous application had been approved with a condition to ensure a phased development and the condition would have to be re-imposed should the application be permitted in order to respond to the higher number of houses. It was noted that the application proposed seven affordable houses in addition to the 86 which had already been approved and the provision of affordable housing remained at 35%.

As part of the previous application, significant financial contributions had been received to transportation and education but there was no justification to request further contributions.

An amended transportation assessment had been received and it was not foreseen that there would be any objection to the development. In addition, an amended linguistic assessment had been received noting that the development would be positive for the language's situation by providing housing in line with GUDP requirements and the needs that had been identified in the Local Housing Needs Survey.

Attention was drawn to the fact that more information was required from Welsh Water as it was in the process of re-assessing to ensure that there was no negative impact on their assets or the environment. If Welsh Water needed more information, it was noted that the applicant was willing to provide the necessary information.

In terms of concerns regarding the impact of the development on the layout of the Listed Ancient Monument, it was not foreseen that the impact would be significant as the houses' locations would not be nearer to the Ancient Monument.

It was considered that the proposed application was acceptable in line with appropriate policies, and it was recommended to delegate the right to approve the application subject to relevant conditions, the completion of a 106 agreement for the seven affordable houses and the receipt of favourable information from Welsh Water.

(b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the objector noted the following main points:

- Reference was made to the Joint Planning Policy Unit's statement which noted that a comparatively low percentage of Welsh speakers in this area were from Bangor, especially the Glyder and Dewi wards - it was noted that the site was not in the Glyder and Dewi wards and that it was in one of Bangor's most Welsh ward, namely the Pentir ward.
- The Welsh language was even at stake in the Pentir ward as the percentage had decreased from 62% in 2001 to 58% in 2011
- Changing the number of houses would have an impact on the language
- It was noted that 50 houses had been sold to local people i.e. if local meant Anglesey/Gwynedd and Conwy, but no further information was provided regarding who would purchase the remainder of the houses together with the empty properties in the area as people moved to the proposed development
- Approximately 1,000 houses were already for sale in Bangor and approximately 200 to let
- The development was not based on local need but rather on profit
- The local schools were full
- Local roads were busy in the mornings and evenings
- Welsh Water had requested that no decision should be made until an additional assessment on sewerage was received
- Strategic policies A1 and A2 of the GUDP were relevant to this application
- An appeal was made to the Committee to refuse this application based on the detrimental impact on the Welsh language given the size and scale of this development

(c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-

- The need for housing within Bangor had been addressed in the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan
- The site was a key topic of a full strategy on the need for housing developments and the site allocated space for 270 houses; the application submitted included less than that
- It would be difficult to accept how any objection could be reasonably justified to the scale of the proposal either based on the Welsh language or any other element
- The proposal involved changing the larger units with a number of smaller units which would address the demand in the housing market and that smaller units were more popular.
- Providing housing in line with the market was the way forward, especially as the development proposed seven additional affordable houses on the site
- The proposal had already been approved and the increase in the number of housing did not raise significant technical elements
- It was ensured that Welsh Water could impose a condition to mitigate any concerns regarding sewerage



(d) The local member (who was a member of this Planning Committee) noted:

- The application submitted had to be considered as an additional development rather than an addition to the original application
- The need in Penrhos had to be considered, and it was explained that Penrhosgarnedd was separate to Bangor and was a village in itself with its own needs
- Concern of a decline in the Welsh language in the Penrhos area, given that approximately 70% of the population spoke Welsh in previous years
- The successes of Gwynedd Council's language policy should not be viewed as a reason to note that the Welsh language would increase
- Concern that any increase in transportation would be an additional increase to what already exists especially as Penrhos is a very busy area in any case
- While affordable housing was welcomed, there were concerns regarding the intention to include flats as part of the development and whether there was evidence of the need for more flats given that several flats were already part of the development
- It was accepted that the development had improved water problems in parts of the area, but by now another property had discovered water in their rear gardens and it was assured that Welsh Water would take this into consideration when dealing with the additional assessment
- There were several questions to be answered and the application submitted needed to be dealt with as a new application and not as an addition to the existing development

(ch) In response to these observations, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that:-

- The site had been allocated for housing and the Planning Committee had approved the previous application to develop 245 houses on the site and the work of the development in line with that permission was ongoing
- The scale of developing the site as well as the statistics were robust evidence that housing was needed with the dependency catchment area
- The GUDP refers to 270 houses for this site which equates to 30 units per hectare
- It was necessary to consider that this was an application for 21 houses within a development which had already been approved and on land which had been allocated for housing
- The housing market constantly changed and the plan had been amended to meet the local need by way of more small units and seven affordable houses which equated to a total of 93 affordable houses from the 21 in the application and the 245 that had already received planning permission, and it included a variety of affordable houses in terms of size on the site
- No objection had been received from Natural Resources Wales
- A linguistic statement had been undertaken for 21 houses and that the application in question for 21 houses within a city on a site which had been allocated for housing and there was robust evidence that there was housing need in the catchment area

It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application contrary to the recommendation of the planning officers as it would be an overdevelopment of housing need in the city, there would be a negative linguistic impact and concerns about transportation infrastructure.

(e) The following main points were noted by individual Members in favour of the recommendation to refuse the application:

- It was premature to approve it and it was necessary to slow down and wait for approximately six years, or when 150 houses had been developed, whichever would happen first, given that the housing market changed very quickly.
- Since permitting 245 houses, several other applications had come to hand and there was concern about the infrastructure in terms of an increase in the transportation which had already had to cope with an increase in the traffic as a result of the other developments that had been approved
- There was no evidence about the need for housing
- Concern that an additional 10% of housing could have a detrimental effect in terms of the area's Linguistic impact
- It was asked whether there was local need for the proposed houses and what would happen to the houses that would be for sale as a result of purchasing the houses on this site
- It was disagreed that the justification for approving the application should be logical
- Concern regarding sewerage

(f) In response, the Senior Planning Service Manager emphasised should the Committee decide to refuse the application, he would refer the application to a cooling off period in line with the standard procedure as there was risks for the Council. He emphasised that refusing the application for the reasons noted would lead to a strong possibility of creating significant financial risks for the Council in an appeal situation, as there was no robust evidence to support the reasons for refusal. The Senior Solicitor reminded everyone present that the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan was a statutory plan and was a tool to adhere to. Whilst accepting that it was possible to challenge the plan, he emphasised that this had to be undertaken with a robust evidence-base.

(ff) The following main points were noted by individual Members against refusing the application:

- Local housing was required for young couples in the area and the development was a method to allow them to have their own homes in the catchment area
- It would be difficult to refuse it as the existing development had already commenced and had been located within the development boundary of the city of Bangor

(g) In accordance with Procedural Rules, the following vote was registered **to refuse the application**:

**In favour of the proposal to refuse the application (8):** Councillors Elwyn Edwards, Simon Glyn, Eric Merfyn Jones, W. Tudor Owen, John Pughe Roberts, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams and Owain Williams.

**Against the proposal to refuse the application (5):** Councillors Gwen Griffith, Anne Lloyd Jones, Michael Sol Owen, Hefin Williams and Eurig Wyn.

**Abstaining (1):** Councillor June Marshall

**Resolved:** To refuse the application contrary to the officers' recommendation due to:

- **An over-provision of unnecessary housing**
- **The linguistic impact**
- **The transportation infrastructure**

**The Senior Planning Service Manager noted his intention, in accordance with the Procedural Rules of this committee, to refer the application to a cooling off period and to bring a further report before the committee highlighting the risks associated with refusing the application.**

**5. Application number C15/1128/44/LL – Cae Eithin, Ffordd Morfa Bychan, Morfa Bychan**

Application to erect four new two-storey dormer bungalows.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the application was within a broader site which had already received outline permission for a residential development of nine houses.

Reference was made to the relevant policies together with the responses received to the public consultations. A letter of objection had been received late from an individual who had already expressed concerns and the report responded to those concerns. In terms of concerns about overlooking and the impact on the houses at the rear, it was explained that the bungalows were single-storey with windows in the roof at a high level.

It was noted that the Transportation Unit were supportive of the application and following consideration of all relevant matters together with the site's planning history, it was considered that the application to erect four dormer bungalows was acceptable and it was recommended to approve the application. It was further noted that a contribution of 33% was affordable housing on the site and therefore there was no need to request a further contribution.

- (b) The Local Member (who was not a member of this Planning Committee) noted:
- That he supported the application in light of the fact that an outline application had already been approved
  - That it was an opportunity to house local young people
  - Concern about the height of the bungalows based on the term "dormer"
- (c) In response, the Senior Development Control Officer explained in terms of the design, there were bedrooms in the roofspace, but they had no dormer windows and it would be possible to include a condition stating that no changes should be made to the roof in future.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**Resolved: To approve the application in accordance with the following conditions together with the following condition outlined by the officer in (c) above:**

- 1. Time**
- 2. Comply with plans**
- 3. Materials / slates**
- 4. Landscaping**
- 5. Highways**
- 6. Drainage**
- 7. Finished floor level details**

**8. Party wall note****9. No changes to the rear roofs****6. Application number C15/1181/44/LL – Bryn Hyfryd, 25 Mersey Road, Borth y Gest**

Application to demolish garage and construct an associated annexe in its place.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the property was an end of terrace house with an access track running alongside it and past its rear in order to provide vehicular access to other houses behind it. The existing garage was located in the furthest rear end of the property's curtilage, and other houses in the terrace had the same type of arrangement.

The proposal involved demolishing the existing garage and erecting a new building on the same footprint to form an associated annexe to the main property which would provide a garden room, a bathroom, together with a spare room to be used as a bedroom/office.

Reference was made to the relevant policies together with the responses received to the public consultations.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the site was located within the development boundary of the village of Borth y Gest and although there was no physical link between the main house and the annexe, the only way into the annexe would be through the garden of the main property, which was within the same ownership.

It was considered that the proposal was acceptable and was an appropriate and sustainable way of providing additional rooms without undermining the planning policies of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan, and complied with the requirements of the relevant planning policies.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the owners of the property next door had objected based on the bathroom window which had been located on the southern elevation which overlooked the path which provided access to the next door property's garden. It was not considered that the window would be likely to cause significant or unacceptable overlooking in this case.

It was noted that the Council's Transportation Unit was happy with the existing parking arrangements and had no objection in terms of road safety.

It was recommended for the planning officers to approve the application as it was not considered that the proposed application was contrary to relevant policies.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the objector noted the following main points:
- Concern that the annexe could be considered a separate residential unit
  - The annexe was an overdevelopment of the site
  - There was no link between the main property and the annexe, only access via a gate at the side of the road which had not been adopted
  - There was a steep decline of between 3-4m between the house's area and the garage and there was no access to the house
  - The report stated that there was no physical link between the main dwelling and the annexe - therefore reiterating that the annexe would be a separate unit

- The report stated that the annexe should not operate separately from the main dwelling as that would be a risk of subdividing the dwelling in the future, and further noted that the annexe provided a self-contained unit - therefore the unit could be sold separately in future
- There were many flats in cities of the same size providing permanent accommodation
- There were 20 properties with associated building on the road which had not been adopted and were suitable for conversion - approving this application would create a precedent for similar applications and because of this it would be impossible to safeguard the amenities of the local neighbourhood
- The local neighbourhood did not support the application
- It was noted that the proposed sliding doors were completely visible from the objector's bedroom window, and therefore it would cause significant overlooking
- The wall of the annexe was twice the length of the existing garage's wall and was made completely of glass doors
- At present, there were no windows on any elevation which overlooked the objector's property, but it was intended to install a "velux" window in the roof for the bathroom
- There would be a significant impact on privacy and it would cause more disruption and overlooking
- There was a potential to increase the use of the registered commercial property at number 25 as holiday accommodation which would have an impact on amenities and local residents
- Parking was available for one vehicle only and that two parking spaces were being abolished - the need for additional parking for the annexe was foreseen
- The Planning Committee was asked to refuse the application as it was a separate dwelling

(c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-

- It was noted that from the beginning, the applicant had sought to consult with planners and had received pre-planning advice
- One of the conditions noted that the annexe was to be associated with the main house
- The objections fell into three categories - parking, privacy and the use of the annexe and especially its use as a separate dwelling
- The applicant was willing to commit to a condition to prevent the annexe from becoming separate
- In terms of parking, it was noted that there were two parking spaces within the site itself and a small concrete patch which the Council owned - if there were problems signs could be installed to prevent parking on the land in question
- The garage had been an eyesore and it was intended to install a slate roof finish on it to tidy it up and therefore it would be an asset to the area
- It was emphasised that it was a small plan measuring 37 square metres and it would be an improvement to what was already there
- An appeal was made for the Planning Committee to support the application.

(d) The Local Member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted that Borth y Gest residents and the Community Council strongly opposed the proposal and attention was drawn to the following points:

- The owner was running a business from the property
- It would create a precedent for the remainder of the terrace

- Overdevelopment
- Concern regarding parking given that parking problems in the village already existed
- No link between the house and the annexe apart from the path

(ch) In response to the above, the Senior Development Control Engineer explained that by demolishing the garage there was no need to provide more parking spaces as two spaces was adequate for the property's needs.

The Senior Planning Service Manager further noted that the application submitted was for an annexe for a dwelling and not a business. It was further noted that it would have been impossible to convert an existing garage into an annexe without planning permission. It was explained that the annexe was relatively small in size, and in line with what an annexe was expected to be in terms of its size, internal layout and its setting with the existing house. It was more or less on the footprint of the existing garage and attention was drawn to the fact that a planning condition had been included to ensure that the annexe was for sub-service use of the existing house.

(d) During the discussion, the following main observations were made:

- Concern regarding the loss of a garage for parking which would exacerbate the property's parking problems
- Several bedrooms in the annexe

(d) It was proposed and seconded that the Planning Committee should visit the site.

**Resolved: To arrange a site visit.**

**7. Application number C15/0348/16/LL – Former Car Park, Pant yr Ardd, Tregarth, Bangor.**

Erect a new two-storey building to be used as a class A1 shop, together with ancillary work including adapting an existing access and creating parking spaces.

(a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the existing site formed part of a car park which was associated with an existing public house on the other side of an adjacent public road, and included a plot which was used as a beer garden / picnic site for one part and on the other part there were community recycling facilities.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the site directly abutted the development boundary of the village of Tregarth. He expanded on the proposal and reference was made to the relevant policies together with the responses to the public consultations.

An objection had been received relating to noise and litter impact but the planning officers believed that it was possible to manage the concern with relevant conditions.

It was considered that the proposal to erect a building to provide a shop was acceptable and met all relevant matters including local and national policies and guidelines.

(b) The Local Member (a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:

- There had been no shop in Tregarth for several years and it could be assured that it would be a viable and successful business
- The building's appearance looked more like a house than a shop and it would be necessary to be vigilant of its use for the future
- The site had been used as a play area and there was concern about child safety

(c) In response to the above, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that should an application be received in years to come to change the shop's use, it would be possible to deal with the application then because it was not possible to impose a condition tying the building to permanent business use. It was added that due to the fact that the land was outside the boundary the relevant policy would not permit open market housing on this type of site. It was further explained that the recycling arrangement was outside planning arrangements and was a matter for the Highways and Municipal Department. It was confirmed that the beer garden and the play area would be abolished.

(ch) The Senior Development Control Engineer explained that in response to a concern regarding losing the parking spaces, there were unrestricted parking opportunities on the street and that it was not a cause for concern for the Transportation Unit.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**Resolved: To approve the application in accordance with the following conditions:**

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Materials (including natural slate)
4. Restrict the use of the building for A3 retail use only
5. Submit ventilation unit details.
6. Restrict the location of waste retention
7. Highways
8. Welsh Water
9. Pollution
10. Limit opening times
11. Manage the recycling site
12. Landscaping
13. Agree on a lighting plan

**Application number C15/1139/46/LL – Glanrafon Fawr, Llangwnadl**

Extend touring caravan site to adjacent field, re-locating one unit and creating 10 new touring units and environmental improvements.

(a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site was located in the countryside and was served by a rural class 3 county road and a farm track. It was noted that the caravan site was on a slight slope, behind a row of mature trees which abutted the Pen y Graig river below in a dip near the farmhouse and the farm buildings.

Reference was made to the relevant policies together with the responses received to the consultations.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the plans had been amended from what was originally submitted with more improvements; landscaping had been proposed after discussions

with officers. It was intended to plant mixed plants on both sides of the field's entrance, to plant more trees around the site and to erect *cloddiau* and small hedges as a screen at the top of the row. It was further noted that the site was relatively hidden and was unobtrusive in the landscape.

The existing site was in operation between 1 March and 31 October and the same period would be relevant to the new units. The legal use certificate permits the permanent storage of 8 of the caravans on their plots, and as part of the improvement the applicant was requested to consider moving the storage caravans over the winter period to a more concealed corner.

It was noted that the nearest neighbours were a field's width away from the site which was a reasonable distance to ensure that neighbours' privacy and amenities were safeguarded.

In terms of transportation and access matters, a concern had been expressed originally about the increase in road traffic as passing places were rare, but it was noted that the applicant had offered to create an additional passing place and as a result the Transportation Unit's objection had been withdrawn. Based on the Transportation Unit's observations, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable subject to the passing place being provided to conform with the requirements involving road safety.

The officers' recommendation was to approve the application in line with relevant conditions.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- It was a simple application for a local family for an addition of 10 touring plots together with environmental improvements and the creation of a new parking space.
  - The proposed application was to upgrade the site to modern standards
  - To mitigate the concerns regarding road safety, the owner had offered to create a new passing place
  - The site was very concealed
- (c) The Local Member (who was a member of this Planning Committee) noted his support of the application and that it complied with all relevant policies and he appealed for the Committee to approve it.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**Resolved: To approve the application in accordance with the following conditions:**

1. **5 years**
2. **In accordance with the amended plans**
3. **Restrict numbers to 28 touring units**
4. **Site all caravans on their plots between 1 March and 31 October**
5. **Holiday only**
6. **Keep a register**
7. **Store the 8 caravans in the location shown on the amended plan**
8. **Install the *cloddiau* before increasing the numbers**



9. **Landscape the *cloddiau* and the internal landscaping in the next planting season and re-plant them if they are damaged or if they die.**
10. **Agree on the finish of the facilities block**
11. **Complete the passing place before increasing the numbers**

**Note: Measures to promote the Welsh language**

**9. Application number C15/1208/16/LL – Penrhyn Quarry, Bethesda**

**The Vice-chair took the chair for the above application because the Chair had to leave to attend another meeting.**

Application to amend condition 2 of permission C15/0276/16/LL to re-locate the building and the small zip's landing point and changes to parking arrangements.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that since the previous application was determined further investigations had discovered that the site which had been permitted was not viable to build on due to the depth of the bedrock and that the company needed to change the location of the building to save the project. Other minor amendments were also requested to the building's design, parking arrangements and the landing location of the small zip.

Reference was made to the relevant policies together with the responses received to the consultations. Since publishing the report, observations had been received from the Biodiversity Unit stating that they had no objection.

The Committee was reminded that the principle had already been approved. The need for a further Community and Linguistic Statement to what had already been submitted was not considered necessary. It was not considered that the proposal would likely have an impact on the amenities of any nearby property or individual or on the landscape and it was recommended to approve the application in line with the relevant conditions.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- The application was similar to the application which had been approved originally but the location of the buildings needed to be changed
  - The building had changed slightly but the proposal and the appearance was the same
  - The Zip World enterprise was growing and was eager to start on the above work
- (c) The Local Member (who was a Member of this Planning Committee) noted that she supported the application and welcomed the enterprise as the company employed local people and the proposed building would be a way to offer convenient facilities for users.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

**Resolved: To approve the application subject to the following conditions:**

**Conditions:**

1. **In accordance with the plans**
2. **In accordance with the conditions of application C12/0276/16/LL (5 years, use, biodiversity, materials and finishes and landscaping)**

The meeting commenced at 1.00pm and concluded at 4.00 p.m.