

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 18 November 2024

---

### Attendance

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

### Councillors

Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Elin Hywel, Huw Wyn Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Cai Larsen, Edgar Owen, Gareth Coj Parry, John Pughe, John Pughe Roberts, Gareth A Roberts and Gruffydd Williams

**Others invited** - Local Members: Councillor Gareth Williams and Councillor Elfed Williams

**Officers:** Keira Sweenie (Planning Manager), Gwawr Hughes (Development Control Team Leader), Miriam Williams (Legal Services) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Gareth Tudor Jones and Gareth Jones (Head of Planning and Environment)

### 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 Elin Hywel (a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.3 - application number C24/0346/45/LL on the agenda
  - Councillor Elfed Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 - application number C24/0385/18/AC on the agenda
  - Councillor Gareth Williams (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.5 - application number C22/0637/32/LL on the agenda

### 3. URGENT ITEMS

As a matter of order, it was reported that since the Chair was joining the meeting virtually, the Legal Officer would announce the results of the voting on the applications.

### 4. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 21 October 2024, as a true record, subject to the following amendments / additions:

5.1 Application Number C24/0205/32/LL Land Near Cae Capel, Botwnnog, Pwllheli, LL53  
8RE

- a) Attention was drawn to the late observations form which included a summary of observations received from Botwnnog Community Council; that new evidence from

the Perthyn Project had been submitted in its entirety to all members, as well as a summary of it from officers.

- b) Bullet point 9 of the Local Member's observations to read as follows; *'That the Welsh Language Commissioner has confirmed that Cyngor Gwynedd has failed to comply with the Welsh Language standards when conducting an assessment of the impacts of the Gwynedd Common Housing Allocation Policy in 2019. Under section 4 of the Welsh Language Measure 2011, the Welsh Language Commissioner has recommended that the Council conduct a comprehensive impact assessment when reviewing and amending this policy.'*
- c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application. Reason: That it is contrary to policy PS1 - significant harm to the Welsh language. The proposer noted, based on new evidence received, that the officers' recommendation was contrary to PS1. *He added that the decision would be made based on the impact that the Common Housing Allocation Policy had on the Welsh language - this did not ask or consider what language the tenants spoke. The Welsh Language Commissioner has confirmed that Cyngor Gwynedd has failed to comply with the Welsh Language standards when assessing the impact of this on the Welsh language.'*

## **5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The Committee considered the following applications for development. Details of the applications were expanded upon and questions were answered in relation to the plans and policy aspects.

### **5.1 Application Number C24/0640/42/LL Glascoed Lôn Cae Glas, Edern, Pwllheli**

Full application to construct a 3-bedroom, two-storey residential property (C3 use) as well as the creation of a new vehicular access.

A decision on the application was deferred at the committee meeting in October, in order to hold a site visit. Some Members had visited the site on 8 November 2024.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application to erect a two-storey residential property within a section of garden in an existing property in the village of Edern; the site was located within the Edern development boundary and the village was identified as a Rural Village in the LDP. Therefore, Policy TAI 4 was relevant. It was reported that the indicative housing supply level for Edern was 12 units, with a total of 3 units completed and 4 units in the windfall land bank. Based on this information, approving a development on this scale would be completely acceptable based on the Village's indicative growth level and as there was only a proposal for 1 house, it did not reach the threshold of needing an affordable housing contribution.

It was explained that planning permission existed on the site until the end of January 2024 for the same development and that decision had been made under the current LDP, therefore the same policy considerations remained. As there was no change in policy or terrestrial terms when visiting the site, it was noted that refusing the application would be completely unreasonable and would likely be subject to appeal costs if the application would be refused. Attention was drawn to an older planning history in the context of the site where applications were refused in the past as the policies were different and on the

grounds that the proposal would add to the number of second homes. In those decisions, there was concern about the size of the site and the ability to provide access and parking, and the Council had no information to the contrary (in the past, outline planning applications would have to outline the site in red only and there was no need to show an indicative layout). In the application in question, it was highlighted that it was possible to provide quality access with plenty of turning space and parking within the curtilage. The Transportation Unit had no objection.

It was noted that the applicant had confirmed that the proposal was for a class C3 permanent residential house. This would mean that it would be possible to manage the use of the site through a condition - this would ensure that this was a permanent residential use of the property and not a holiday use or second home use.

In the context of visual impact, it was explained that there was variety to the size and design of nearby houses and, although some concerns had been expressed about the impact of the house on neighbours, it was considered that the dwelling had been designed carefully to protect amenities. It was reported that there was no intention to install a first floor window on the south-eastern side of the property that would face the nearby gardens but there was an intention to install a balcony with an opaque glass screen measuring 1.8 metres high, on the south-eastern side of the balcony. It was not considered that there were any grounds to refuse the application based on amenity impact - the application was in accordance with policy PCYFF 2.

It was expressed that there was no valid planning reason to refuse the application. The officers recommended to approve in accordance with the conditions.

- b) Although the Local Member had apologised, he had submitted the following observations in an e-mail:
- Despite being familiar with the site in Edern, going into the garden and seeing the exact location, as well as receiving information from Keira Sweenie about the application had been very helpful. I saw why it was an application for a two-storey house, as there was insufficient space to build a bungalow there.
  - I continue to object this application on the grounds of 1- Unsuitable access to the parking near the house to an extremely narrow and extremely dangerous unpaved road.
  - The house was too big and too prominent. It does not suit the area at the end of a small terrace of houses.
  - As the living rooms, kitchen and balcony would be on the upper floor, the house would overlook neighbouring houses. Should there be a clear condition with the application to ensure the retention of the existing trees on the boundary, this would prevent overlooking and would be less of a threat to the privacy and amenities of residents who lived permanently in the nearby houses.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:
- C3 use only
  - Refusing would be unreasonable
  - The application had been approved in 2019 - the only change since then was a reduction in speed limit (from 30mph to 20mph) being imposed on the road, which would make it safer

- Include a condition regarding protecting and retaining the trees / hedge on the boundary to avoid over-looking

In response to a question regarding a review of the Local Development Plan and the 5-year time condition, it was noted that approving a plot for one house would not likely impact Edern's housing figures in the future, when the new plan would be introduced (2027).

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

1. **Time**
2. **Compliance with plans**
3. **Exterior materials/finishes**
4. **There is a need to ensure that a 1.8 metre high opaque glass screen is installed on the south-western side of the balcony at all times.**
5. **Boundary wall near the access to be no higher than 1 metre.**
6. **Parking and turning spaces to be operational in accordance with the plan before the property is occupied for the first time.**
7. **No hedge or vegetation clearing between 1 March and 31 August.**
8. **Erection of the soil *clawdd* before the property is occupied for the first time.**
9. **Agree on a landscape plan.**
10. **Implement the landscaping plan.**
11. **To restrict the occupancy of the property to a permanent residence.**
12. **Withdrawal of PD rights**
13. **Green Infrastructure Statement**
14. **Agree on a building management plan**
15. **Welsh Name**
16. **Protect and retain the hedge on the boundary**

## **5.2 APPLICATION NUMBER C24/0362/38/AC Woodcroft, Llanbedrog, Pwllheli, Gwynedd, LL53 7UA**

Application to amend condition 2 of planning permission C21/1210/38/LL to refer to revised plans as part of this s73 application rather than the plans submitted on 14/12/21 as referred to in condition 2.

Attention was drawn to the late observations form. It was noted that the Community Council had presented observations and the Planning Manager had fully read them out aloud.

Some Members had visited the site on 8 November 2024

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a retrospective application to amend a condition on planning permission that was previously granted to retain the development as it had been built. Following an investigation into allegations that the development had not been built in accordance with what was approved, it became clear that there were inconsistencies on earlier plans that were approved in terms of the height of the original house with the prospective property although the rest of the plans from a design standpoint were correct. As a result, and to regulate the situation, a further application

was submitted to amend the condition relating to carrying out the development in accordance with the plans approved.

It was reported that the application had been submitted to the committee at the request of the Local Member in response to local concerns.

A discussion on the application was postponed in a previous committee to correct the plans from the standpoint of form and layout of the access and the parking area in front of the site and to reflect what is seen on the site. It was explained that the footpath had changed to a winding access ramp instead of a row of straight stairs as originally shown on the plans submitted. As a result, a second consultation was held with the Community Council, the Local Member, neighbours, objectors and the Transportation Unit. It was noted that with the consent of the Committee Chair, a site visit was held to give the Committee members an opportunity to see the property and the surrounding area.

Attention was drawn to the lengthy planning history of the site, detailing that an application to demolish a bungalow and erect a brand-new dwelling had been refused. It was highlighted that the application had been refused due to the appearance and design, local market housing policy and the impact on neighbours' amenities. Following this, an application was approved to erect a single-storey house on the site.

It was highlighted that there had been allegations that the owner had built the house that was refused, but it was noted that this was incorrect and reference was made to the plans and the pictures submitted as part of the committee report which showed that the development seen on the site was completely different to the refused plan. It was reiterated that this plan included three floors to the property (a garage on the ground floor, living space on the first floor and living space within the roof space, as well as a balcony). It was noted that the development that was now seen on the site was a single-storey dwelling - it did not include a balcony and living space, roof space or a garage under the property. As an ancillary note, it was also noted that minor amendments had been approved to the original permission.

In the context of the principle of the development, it was noted that the application had already been accepted through previous permission and no changes had been made from a policy standpoint. It was therefore considered that the principle remained to be acceptable. In terms of the design of the proposal, it was suggested that the appearance was the same as the previous permission, and although there was increase in the height, such height was not uncommon in comparatively intense built situations such as this and it does not stand out as the highest building in the neighbourhood. It was considered that the amendments to the access arrangements offered improvement to the design and ensured access to all.

In the context of residential amenities, consideration was given to the changes, which concluded that the impact of what has been built was substantially greater than what was already approved.

It was reported, as with any retrospective application, that there is a need to consider the application on its own merits and, although it was not possible to excuse any unauthorised work, the fact that the application was retrospective was not a valid reason for refusing it, and the planning process should not be used as a process to punish an applicant. It was reiterated that the applicant had listened and received advice from officers and had submitted an application to try to regulate the situation. Despite

acknowledging that there were strong feelings against the application locally, the changes were not considered to be substantially different in terms of impact and appearance compared to the original permissions and it was not considered that the impact would create a more significant detrimental impact than what was considered acceptable in the past.

It was considered that the application was acceptable and the Officers recommended to approve.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:
- That they represented Penygraig residents and the people next door to Woodcroft
  - That the current height of the building was 2m higher than the plans
  - That the plan did not follow the design and access statement
  - That the plans were incorrect - no as built overlays were shown. An independent architect had compared the plans - possible to present copies.
  - That the application did not comply with the LDP policies
  - It created an incompatible feature in the local environment; harmful to residential amenities.
  - The house was the size of an open market house, not a local market house.
  - Had been built contrary to plans - concern that this could set a precedent to act against the advice of the planning department.
  - That the building was an over-development - this was a two-storey building, and not a single-storey as had been approved. One large, pointless window on the second floor
  - This was an attempt from the developer for approval and not to receive advice.
  - Concern once again of placing buildings within a close community with permanent neighbours - sites like these were becoming scarce.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following observations:
- That the current 2m height was not higher than what was approved - there was only a difference of 25cm
  - The plans were correct - the applicant had not ignored the planning process
  - That the plans aimed to correct a mistake made in the original street-scene plan and some other minor amendments - the size was correct - the building being erected was substantially smaller than the plans that were refused
  - No intention for the house to become a holiday home - this would be a full-time home for the applicant
  - It would not have a detrimental impact on nearby gardens - a nearby holiday accommodation score praised the beauty and the tranquillity - no score impact
  - The sun's path did not create a shadow over the cottage and garden next door
- d) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following comments:
- Disagreed with the officers' conclusions - the building was an incompatible feature within the local built environment, contrary to PCYFF3 criteria - the design did not suit the area; it did not add or improve the character or appearance of the site
  - Expert planning evidence had highlighted that the building had been erected to a height that was refused in 2021 – the plans had been magnified

- That the site was within an AONB and Mynydd Tir y Cwmwd area which was within a SSSI - contrary to AMG 1 policy requirements
  - The proposed development was harmful to the residential amenities of nearby property owners - it created an oppressive element over neighbouring gardens and an overlooking impact - contrary to PCYFF 2 - protecting the amenities of local residents
  - The house was beyond the size earmarked for a local market house and was therefore contrary to Policy TAI 5 - creating an open market dwelling that would exclude the majority of local residents - therefore contrary to Policy TAI 5 objectives
  - The levels were incorrect - the concerns needed to be addressed
  - The proposal had ruined Bwthyn Begw
  - Concern of setting a dangerous precedent of not accepting advice and submitting a retrospective application
  - A suggestion to defer to ensure that it was possible to check the measurements with a third party or refuse as it was a feature that was visible from the shoreline, the sea and the mountain. The AONB needed to be protected.
- e) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application in accordance with the refusal reasons 1 and 2 to application C21/0452/38/LL (2021):
- 'The proposed building would create an incompatible feature in the local built environment and, consequently, the proposal is contrary to the requirements of Criteria 1, 2 and 3 of policy PCYFF 3 of the LDP 2011-2026 as the proposal does not add or enhance the character and appearance of the site or the area in terms of layout, appearance, scale, height, mass and elevation treatment. It was not considered that the development would suit the area in terms of design and layout and it would likely be harmful to the built environment in this part of the Llŷn AONB. The application was therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy AMG 1 of the LDP.
  - The proposed development would be harmful to the residential amenities of nearby property owners as it would create an oppressive element over neighbouring gardens and would also cause substantial overlooking impacts that would be harmful to the amenities of those properties' residents. The application was contrary to policy PCYFF2 of the LDP as it related to protecting the amenities of local residents.'
- f) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:
- That the proposal seemed to be oppressive - larger than what was approved
  - Concern of setting a dangerous precedent of ignoring conditions and planning rules - needed to check developments step-by-step.
  - That the building was unsuitable in its environment.
  - Needed specific facts / measurements - what was on the site from what was originally approved?
  - The measurements were unclear - the building was built and therefore the proposal needed to be assessed based on what was to be seen on the site.
  - That evidence had been submitted highlighting errors in the levels.

**RESOLVED: To refuse the application**

**Reason:**

- **Over-development. Concern that the height and size of the proposal creates an oppressive element over a nearby property and disturbs and impacts neighbours' amenities, contrary to Policy PCYFF 2**

### **5.3 APPLICATION NUMBER C24/0346/45/LL Land in Allt Fawr, Lôn Nant-stigallt, Pwllheli, LL53 5YY**

Change the use of land and develop a new holiday accommodation in the form of a) 2 permanent glamping pods and associated parking; b) 33 pitches for touring caravans and associated parking; c) welfare facilities including a toilet block, shower block and storage; and d) associated access arrangements, footpath link to Ffordd Abererch, drainage and landscaping.

- a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that the site was located on a hillock in the open countryside on the outskirts of Pwllheli Town with residential houses located at the bottom of the hillock; the site was located within an Area of Historical Interest and was on the outskirts of a Wildlife Site and the bottom of the hillock was designated a C2/Zone 2 and 3 flood area.

In the context of the principle of the development, and the fact that the proposal included touring and permanent units, it was explained that the relevant policies were TWR 3 and TWR 5 and their criteria focused on visual impact and acceptable access to the site. It was reported that a Landscape and Visual Appraisal had been submitted as part of the application which included standpoints from the site, the nearby area and from a distance. It was reiterated that the Appraisal was of a good standard and it confirmed that the development would not be visible from the majority of the standpoints, and whilst the development would be visible from some high or distant standpoints, only a part of the site would be visible, or it would also be visible in the context of Pwllheli's wider view. It was noted that there was an intention to further landscape the site and, therefore, it was considered that the proposal would not have an unacceptable visual impact.

In the context of transportation and access, it was reported that there was a proposal to improve current access into the site and to use it as a main entrance for the development. It was reiterated that a Transportation Statement had been submitted with the application and, despite acknowledging that Lôn Nant Stigallt was generally narrow with some steep parts, the entrance to the site was near the junction with the A499. It was described that the width of the carriageway at this part was larger than the average for the road, and the Statement confirmed that it was possible to achieve two-way traffic for this part. As a result, with the intention of either providing passing places, or achieving a one-way system across the rest of the road, the Transportation Unit considered that the use of the road was acceptable.

In the context of the layout of both permanent pods proposed, it was noted that the site was not located within the AONB or Special Landscape Area, and in accordance with the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Study, the number of units proposed was defined as a very small development, and was therefore not considered as over-provision. In the context of the touring units, it was explained that it was possible to ensure hard standings, for the use of touring units only and holiday use by imposing planning conditions. It was considered that the facility building was suitable and appropriate, and respected the context of the site and its place in the landscape.



Attention was drawn to concerns submitted on the impact on the amenities of nearby residents, but it was considered, based on the distance and concealed nature of the site, the proposal would not have a substantial detrimental impact on any nearby residents. It was noted that consideration had been given to concerns relating to the impact on tree roots, highlighting that some had now been resolved by plans submitted by the Biodiversity Unit which would mean moving one of the touring plots, further information from the applicant, and planning conditions. It was reiterated that archaeological, flooding and linguistic matters had been addressed and the proposal was acceptable in terms of those matters.

It was considered that the proposal was acceptable and the officers recommended to approve the application subject to relevant conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following observations:
- He was the owner of the site. Had retired from the Police and hoped to establish a new enterprise to support his family
  - The location was concealed by natural landscape features
  - He welcomed that some of the members had visited the site and, as a result, they shared his vision
  - He had received pre-application advice and had collaborated with the officers
  - That the application supported the attempt to reduce the demand for Airbnb use so that it was possible to release houses for local people
  - There were no touring sites in the nearby local area
  - He had an intention to manage the land effectively - had contacted NRW to discuss rare plants
  - It would employ local businesses
  - The application submitted complied with local policies
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following comments:
- That the application was complex and there were strong feelings locally
  - People near the site had been in contact, expressing concern for the use of a connecting road which was narrow and winding, the use of the road had increased substantially recently, and the mouth of the road was dangerous to touring caravans
  - Concern from residents who lived at the bottom of the cliff regarding safety / movement on the hillock. Experiences of sheep falling; the development would likely carry noise that would cause disturbance
  - That the applicant was a local man who intended to create a development that would maintain his family, local workers and local businesses. Considered the business as a kind business which respected sustainable tourist characteristics and respected the Welsh language
  - The site was beautiful - landscape work had been completed to make the best of the site
- d) In response to the traffic comments, the Planning Manager noted that the current traffic on the road was not caused by the applicant's enterprise. She reiterated that there were improvement plans for the road to be implemented in the near future which would include a plan with one-way restrictions or creation of passing places. She noted that it was possible to impose a condition that would ask the applicant when advertising the site to use the entrance from the A499.

In the context of the safety of the hillock, it was noted that it would not be unreasonable to impose a condition to fence the site. It was reiterated that the Biodiversity Unit had suggested this to protect the site.

- e) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:
- The site was concealed
  - Local people who wished to stay locally needed to be supported
  - Should it be approved, assurance was needed that the work would be implemented in accordance with the requirements

In response to an observation that work to clear the site had been made before the application was approved, the Planning Manager noted that the applicant was the owner of the site and that he had the right, under farm payment regulations, to implement clearing work without permission. She reiterated that complaints regarding the clearing work had been investigated.

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

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

1. Time
2. In accordance with the amended plans.
3. Restrict the number of touring units to 33 caravans and 2 pods only.
4. Holiday use only and maintain a register.
5. Touring unit's holiday season - 1 March to 31 October.
6. No storing of touring caravans on the site.
7. Complete the landscaping plan in the first planting season following approval.
8. Trees and hedges along the site's boundaries must be retained.
9. Any hard standings are limited to caravan pitches only.
10. Agree on electricity and water utilities pathways.
11. Present Toadflax-leaved St John's-wort *Hypericum linariifolium* Management Plan
12. Complete Biodiversity improvements in accordance with the information submitted
13. Highways Conditions
14. Construction work hours
15. Welsh Name
16. Bilingual advertisements
17. Main site access notification information off the A499
18. Install a fence around the site to ensure the safety of users

Notes:

Public Protection Note

Highways Notes

NRW letter note

Welsh Water letter note

SUDS note

Licensing Note

#### **5.4 Application Number C24/0385/18/AC Victoria Terrace, High Street, Deiniolen, Gwynedd, LL55 3LT**

Vary condition 2 of planning permission C20/0485/18/AC (amendment to planning permission number C17/0438/18/LL for a residential development) to allow a further three years for the approval of reserved matters.

- a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application to vary condition 2 of a previous planning permission to extend the time given to submit a reserved matters application on the original outline permission in 2009. It was explained that the application did not relate to the reserved matters.

It was reported that the proposal continued to involve developing the site for 27 houses which included 5 affordable houses for general local need (a mixture of social and intermediate houses), creating a new entrance as well as providing an amenity space. It was reiterated that the original application was subject to the 106 legal agreement to provide the element of affordable housing and this aspect would not need to be updated as its content continued to be valid. It was reiterated that the principle of developing the site for a residential development had already been accepted under the original outline application in 2009, as well as follow-up applications approved to extend the period of 3 years every time and the latest permission continued on the site and established the principle of this latest application. The importance of considering, whether the planning situation or circumstances had changed since the previous applications was outlined.

In the context of the application site, it was explained that the field was a 0.8 hectare agricultural field which was served by the agricultural entrance from the class 3 county road, and since the last planning permission, the application had been formally included within the World Heritage Site. It was noted that the site continued to be within the Deiniolen development boundary and had been designated for housing; it contributed towards the indicative supply level for the village and the information submitted as part of the application. A Housing Mix Statement was submitted which confirmed that the proposed housing mix addressed the need identified within the Gwynedd Housing Need Assessment, as well as an assessment for the village of Deiniolen. It was explained that the western side of the site had been earmarked for biodiversity enhancement space and to reduce surface water run-off to justify lower than usual density for this site.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the applicant had noted that it was not possible to develop the site within the period of the current permission, and that being as a result of Covid and the economic climate. It was highlighted that there was no long-term barrier that would prevent the development from moving forward, and therefore, accepting the application would extend the planning permission less than a year after the final date of the LDP and that extending the period was therefore reasonable.

The Members were reminded that a brief plan of the proposed site had been included with the application and the design and layout of the houses would receive detailed attention during an application for reserved matters.

It was reported that the Transportation Unit, Natural Resources Wales, Welsh Water and the Council's Environment and Water Unit had no objection to the proposal subject to appropriate conditions and attention was drawn to the additional information submitted as

part of the application on biodiversity matters offering other acceptable improvements and mitigation measures.

In the context of the Welsh language matters, it was considered that the possibility that a small percentage of prospective occupants of the open market houses were non-Welsh speakers, but the proposal would be subject to a condition to ensure that the houses were used as sole residence and that it would not be possible to use them as a second home or a holiday unit without further planning permission. In addition, it was noted that awareness could be raised of the language by carrying out mitigation measures, and it was anticipated that the majority of the children that would derive from the development would go to local schools where there was emphasis on learning through the medium of Welsh.

It was considered that the proposal was acceptable and continued to comply with the requirements of relevant local and national policies. The officers recommended to approve the application with the relevant conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations;
- 94 people were on the social housing list. Who were they? How local were they?
  - The intention was to erect 27 houses here. How many would be for local people?
  - The application went back over 10 years - nothing had happened.
  - The local opinion had not changed. Object.
  - Water and Environment Context - due to the size and nature of the development, an application would have to be submitted to the SAB for approval. Who was SAB?
  - Who would monitor the work, who would ensure that the correct measures were being followed?
- c) In response to the comments, the Planning Manager noted that SAB was the 'Sustainable Drainage Body' – a process which is a separate but similar process to a building control arrangement. She reiterated that the monitoring work would be done by the Planning Department officers, and although resources were scarce, enforcement staff would be able to monitor the sites.
- d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- e) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by members:
- The proposal was within the development boundary - this was an application for a time extension
  - It was about time to commence construction
  - An over-development of social housing

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

- 1. Commencement of the work.**
- 2. Submitting reserved matters.**
- 3. Materials and finishes (including natural slate for the roofs).**
- 4. Access and parking.**
- 5. Landscaping.**
- 6. Removal of permitted development rights for the affordable houses.**
- 7. Welsh Water conditions relating to safeguarding the sewers.**

8. **Conditions of Natural Resources Wales regarding land and surface water draining.**
9. **Update the conditions regarding mitigation measures of the ecological assessment.**
10. **Agree on details regarding Welsh names for the development together with advertising signage informing and promoting the development**
11. **Restrict the use to C3 use class residential dwellings**

Notes: Need to submit a sustainable drainage system application to be agreed with the Council.

**5.5 Application Number C22/0637/32/LL Land near Congl Meinciau Estate, Botwnnog, Pwllheli, LL53 8RA**

Full application for a development of 8 affordable homes with associated works, on a rural exception site (phase 1 of 2)

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that correspondence had been received by the agent asking the committee to defer a decision on the application to be able to try to respond to the refusal reasons and submit more information
- b) It was proposed and seconded to defer the decision

**DECISION: To defer so that the applicant has an opportunity to respond to the refusal reasons and submit further information**

The meeting commenced at 13:00 and concluded at 14:40

---

CHAIR