

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 3 February 2025

---

<b>Attendance</b>	Chair: Cllr Elwyn Edwards Vice-chair: Cllr Huw Rowlands
<b>Councillors:</b>	Berwyn P Jones, Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Elin Hywel, Gareth T Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Edgar Owen, Gareth Coj Parry, John Pughe, John Pughe Roberts and Gruffydd Williams
<b>Others invited:</b>	Councillor Elin Walker Jones – item 5.1 Local Member
<b>Officers:</b>	Gareth Jones (Head of Planning and Environment), Keira Sweenie (Planning Manager), Robyn Jones (Deputy Monitoring Officer), Gwawr Hughes (Development Control Team Leader) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Gareth A Roberts and Councillor Cai Larsen.

### 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 Walker Jones (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.1 (C24/0916/11/DT) on the agenda
  - Councillor Huw Rowlands (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.4 (C20/1093/24/LL) on the agenda

### 3. URGENT ITEMS

As a matter of order, it was reported that since the Chair and Deputy Monitoring Officer were joining the meeting virtually, the Assistant Head of Department would be announcing the results of the voting on the applications.

### 4. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 13 January 2025, as a true record, subject to noting that Councillor Berwyn Parry Jones was present at the meeting.

### 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 C24/0916/11/DT

**14, Rhodfa Belmont, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 2HT**

Two-storey extension at the rear of the property

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

Some Members had visited the site on 30 January 2025.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this application was for the demolition of an existing multi-purpose room to the rear of the property and construction of a two-storey flat roof extension. The application was deferred at the Planning Committee in January 2025 in order to undertake a site visit. It was explained that the property was a semi-detached property in a residential area in the city of Bangor, with the application submitted to the Planning Committee at the request of the local member.

Reference was made to the objections received. In terms of design and appearance, it was considered that this type of extension was not unexpected in residential areas, and therefore it would not have an unacceptable visual impact. In response to the comments that raised concerns about loss of light, it was noted that a detailed assessment of the impacts had concluded that the impact of the extension would not be harmful in terms of loss of light or an oppressive impact (despite it being a two-storey extension, it was only 0.5m longer than the existing rear extension).

It was highlighted that the Members during the site visit had suggested using light coloured render on the extension walls and that this suggestion was acceptable. It was also noted that the applicant had stated it was intended to move the existing garden shed to the highest corner of the garden on the left to allow more light into the rear of number 16.

Reference was made to the objections received regarding the wider flooding problems on the street in general, as well as the development's impact on the area's drains. It was noted that the observations received from Welsh Water had asked for a condition to prevent additional flows of surface water into the sewerage system. The Council's Drainage Unit did not object to the proposal. Despite acknowledging the concern, there was no robust evidence that the extension would affect or exacerbate the current situation. Subject to the nature of the drains, private or as a part of the public drainage system, it was reiterated that there would be protection either through the building control system or Welsh Water rules, therefore it was not considered that drainage matters were a planning reason to object to the proposal.

Having considered all relevant planning matters, the local and national policies and guidance, the proposal was considered to be acceptable. The Officers recommended to approve the application with conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following comments:
- That she objected to the application.
  - That Hafod Planning, on behalf of the occupant of number 16, had highlighted the arguments for refusing the application
  - There were three contentious reasons for refusing - drainage, amenities and impact on character.
  - Character - the house would look very different to all the other houses and would create a substantial visible impact on the appearance of a semi-detached house. The extension was on an enormous scale.
  - Amenities - number 16 would lose light and the extension would create unbearable significant overlooking; given the nature of the area's topography, the development would exacerbate the situation.
  - The patio of number 16 would lose light due to the positioning of number 14's shed.

- Drainage - consideration had to be given to the steep landscape of the garden to the rear of the property, as well as a drain that had been installed between 14 and 16 to deal with surface water.
  - The work of laying the foundations for the extension was likely to have an impact - this element had not been addressed by officers.
  - Drainage, overflow, surface water and climate change had led to an increase in the area's water levels - a meeting was needed with YGC to discuss this. Some houses in the street had damp and required water pumps - the situation needed a thorough assessment and a robust drainage system to avoid these difficulties in the long term.
  - Encouraged the Committee to refuse the application.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application in accordance with the recommendation.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- The site visit had been beneficial - the area was limited with steep land to the rear.
  - The proposal was an over-development - out of character with the rest of the street.
  - The development was one of a pair of semi-detached houses and there was a need to consider the resident in number 16.
  - A suggestion to impose a condition to move the shed to a less intrusive and conspicuous spot in the garden.
  - The extension responded to the family's needs.
  - The Well-being of Future Generations Act - needed to ensure that the well-being of residents was considered.
  - No observations from Bangor City Council.

In response to the suggestion for a condition to move the shed, it was noted that it was not possible to impose a condition as it was not part of the application, but reference was made to the late observations that stated that the applicant intended to move the shed to the highest corner of the garden.

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

- 1. Commencement within five years.**
- 2. In accordance with the plans**
- 3. Materials to be in-keeping**
- 4. Biodiversity Enhancements**
- 5. Ensure no surface water runs onto the highway.**

Note: Welsh Water

## **5.2 APPLICATION NUMBER C24/0916/11/DT**

**Fferm Fronhyfryd, Bwlchtocyn, Pwllheli, Gwynedd, LL53 7EU**

**Full application for improvements to the site to include minor amendments to the location and design of the previously approved service building along with extending existing tracks and other environmental improvements**

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that this was a full application involving improvements to a touring caravan and camping site, including amending the location and design of the previously approved service building along with extending existing access roads within the site and undertaking environmental improvements. There would be no increase in the number of touring caravans on site from the 24 that had previously been approved. The caravans would remain sited around the site boundary near the existing hedgerows that surrounded the site.

In terms of visual amenities, it was noted that it was intended to carry out additional landscaping by planting new trees and hedges on the land. It was reported that the proposal was not likely to create an intrusive and prominent feature in the landscape within the AONB designation. Similarly, it was noted that the site was located within the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest and in terms of location and size, it would not have a wider impact on the historic landscape and would therefore comply with Policy AT1

In terms of the principle of the development, it was considered that the design of the services building was acceptable and in keeping with the area and that the proposals to improve biodiversity were acceptable and in line with relevant policies.

Reference was made to a letter of objection that had been received noting an increase in the number of seasonal caravans in the local area. It was noted that the number of caravans would be managed through conditions and it was emphasised that this was an application for improvements only and that the lawful use already existed.

Given the local and national policies and guidance, the Officers recommended approving the application.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following points:
- The main purpose of the proposal was to move the services building away from the public sewer.
  - The applicant wanted to improve the site
  - The site had a Welsh name and bilingual information on their website along with bilingual signage on the site.
  - Should it be approved, it was hoped to complete the work before the beginning of the 2025 summer season.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- He did not have a personal opinion on the matter
  - Potential problems were that the road was narrow (traffic), noise and the old rubbish tip.

In response to an observation from the Licensing Unit for the need to ensure 3m between the caravans and the hedgerow and whether this could be conditioned, it was noted that there was no need to include a condition, rather the applicant had to ensure compliance by seeking a permit.

It was proposed and seconded to approve the application

**RESOLVED To approve subject to conditions**

**1. Time**

2. **Compliance with plans**
3. **Carry out the development in accordance with an ecological report**
4. **Carry out the development in accordance with a Construction Environmental Management Plan**
5. **Carry out the development in accordance with a lighting plan**
6. **Restrict the number of caravans**
7. **Restrict the period of site use**
8. **Remove all caravans from the site outside the period of site use**
9. **Restrict caravan/boat/vehicle storage outside the formal pitches**
10. **Restrict the use of the caravans to holiday use only**
11. **Bilingual signage**
12. **Welsh name**
13. **Materials**
14. **Landscaping plan**
15. **Drainage matters**

### **5.3 APPLICATION NUMBER C24/0684/38/LL**

#### **Glan Y Gors, Llanbedrog, Gwynedd, LL53 7UB**

A retrospective planning application to re-build a cottage with two-storey side extensions and a rear single-storey extension.

- a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that the application was to demolish an existing dwelling and construct a new house in its place. It was explained that the site was located on the outskirts of the village of Llanbedrog and outside any development boundary and was surrounded by extensive established woodland with land rising to the rear and the side of the property. It was reiterated that the site and the wider area were within the Llŷn AONB and the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest designations.

It was noted that the proposal did not involve an increase in the number of bedrooms and that the information submitted with the application confirmed that the current and intended use of the property was as a holiday cottage. Consequently, there would be no change to the use. It was expressed that planning consent has already been approved in 2021 to extend the original property, but the current proposal was the result of that proposal after discovering that the original cottage was not suitable to be extended.

Attention was drawn to Policy TAI 13 and its relevant criteria which specifically related to replacing dwellings. It was noted that the Structural Report on the original cottage had been submitted by a qualified engineer justifying the demolition work that was needed due to significant defects. Additionally, it was considered that the scale of the proposal was similar to what had been approved previously in the form of extensions to the original cottage.

In the context of visual amenities, the site was not entirely visible from public vantage points and it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of its design and finish. It was not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the broader landscape including the AONB and the Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest. It stood a distance from any other property and it would not have a detrimental impact on any nearby residents. It was not considered that it would have any impact on road safety, as there was sufficient space to turn and park on the site.

In terms of biodiversity issues, it was noted that the proposal included acceptable improvements that would be secured through a planning condition.

In terms of linguistic matters, the proposal did not involve any change of use and there was no increase in the number of bedrooms. Consequently, it was not considered that it would have any impact on the Welsh language.

Having considered all relevant planning matters, it was considered that the proposal was acceptable and the officers recommended approving the application with conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following points:
- Planning permission had been approved in 2021 and construction work had commenced the following summer.
  - Following heavy rainfall, the foundations had been found to be defective and unstable which had led to additional work.
  - The plans had been amended to be able to improve access and to move the location of the kitchen to have more light.
  - The original section in the middle of the house had been kept and the original stonework had been exposed.
  - The drainage system had been renewed - the system had been modernised.
  - The front door had been restored.
  - The house had been renewed for future generations
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following observations:
- That retrospective applications had been increasing in her ward for some time with a vast number of residents contacting her asking her to intervene; highlighting concerns due to the lack of respect towards local planning policies.
  - The belief was that there was 'one rule for local people to live in 94 square metre houses and another rule for holiday home and holiday let owners!' It appeared they had the right to demolish and extend the size of their properties.
  - The application was a classic example of extending and demolishing and rebuilding more than what was acceptable.
  - The application was within the boundary of the AONB and the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest - the report had intentionally chosen not to remind Members of the 'Statutory Duty to protect these designated lands'
  - The Community Council had noted ... "The new building is substantially larger than the original", however, the officer said "only slightly larger" without adding how much larger it was horizontally in additional square meters.
  - The Community Council said that the engineering work had had a considerable effect on biodiversity contrary to policies e.g. the biodiversity department had said that there was a possibility that the work had damaged bat roosts and bat habitats.
  - The costs of improving, repairing and altering in order to meet the requirements of the owners and current standards was "likely be substantial and prohibitive" - the risk once more of not having a report that had not been commissioned by the applicant. There should be an unbiased structural report from a third party - it was very easy to submit such a report after the house had been demolished and then submit a retrospective application.
  - Building within the footprint - it was very apparent to those who were familiar with the location that the new house was substantially larger than the original cottage. There was a history of one extension after the other before the retrospective application had been

submitted to the Planning Committee. The officer stated "that extensive changes have been undertaken to the building over the years"

- That the residents of Llanbedrog were pleading on the Committee to refuse the application - over-development of the site and harmful impact on the AONB and the Llŷn and Enlli Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

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

Reasons: That the proposal was an over-development and it would have a detrimental impact on the AONB

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

- There were several extensions here - had not kept to the original foundations / footprint.
- The property was now substantially different to the original cottage.
- There was a lack of respect for Cyngor Gwynedd's planning process - any architect, if there was a need to amend plans, would have known of the need to notify the planning department.
- Another retrospective application - there was a need to manage the situation - it was developing into a fashionable thing to do.
- There was a need to emphasise that planning permission was needed. Were there flaws in the system?
- The new house was of a substantial size - much bigger than the original - the requirement was to build on the footprint.
- Concern regarding setting a precedent of demolishing small houses and building large houses in their place.
- The size of three bedroom houses for local people was 94m<sup>2</sup>!
- It would create a harmful impact on the AONB - trees had been felled.

In response to a question that the original house had been a holiday home and was demolished and if the proposal was now for a new house, would there be a need to reconsider the new use of the house, it was noted that Policy 13 (Demolishing and Replacing which referred to the use of dwellings), stated that if the holiday use existed already, there was no need to consider changing it. Should a condition be set limiting the holiday use, the right to build a house would be lost.

In response to an observation on the footprint of the new house, it was noted that the original cottage measured 148m<sup>2</sup> and with the approved alterations it would have measured 184m<sup>2</sup>: 201m<sup>2</sup> had been built which overall was 50m<sup>2</sup> larger than the original surface area.

In response to a question that this was a second home and not a holiday cottage and whether it would be possible to change the use, it was noted that there was a right to change the use if needed, but this would mean losing a local house.

**RESOLVED: TO REFUSE, contrary to the recommendation**

**Reasons:**

- **Over-development**
- **Harmful impact on the landscape / AONB contrary to policy TAI 13.**

## 5.4 APPLICATION NUMBER C20/1093/24/LL

### Land by Talardd, Dinas, Caernarfon, LL54 7YN

Application to erect 16 dwellings with associated access, parking and landscaping

Attention was drawn to the late observations form.

- a) The Development Control Team Leader highlighted that this was a full application to provide 16 affordable homes with a mix of houses, bungalows and flats that would also provide access for pedestrians to the A487, a vehicular access to the site and a formal play area with equipment in the centre of the site. It was explained that the site stood partly within the development boundary of the village of Dinas, opposite a garage and an outdoor equipment shop, with residential houses located opposite it and to its side. It was reiterated that the site had been used as a compound for a housing development located directly next door and was previously an informal car park after the demolition of a restaurant that had been located there.

As the majority of the site was located within the development boundary of Dinas the application was considered under Policy TAI 4, but there was also a small part of the site outside the development boundary and it was therefore subject to policy TAI 16 as an exception site. It was reported that the indicative housing supply level for Dinas, along with the number of units completed and the land bank meant that the village would exceed its indicative growth level, and justification would be required for the proposal along with a language statement.

It was expressed that the houses would be managed by Adra, a Registered Social Housing Landlord which provided community housing for the area. It was noted that an Affordable Housing Statement and a Housing Mix Statement had been submitted with the application noting there was a proven need for smaller houses to meet the needs of smaller families. In terms of planning policy, it was considered that the proposal provided an appropriate number of affordable housing and that an appropriate mix of housing has been proposed in accordance with the need identified and confirmed by the Strategic Housing Unit. In addition, reference was made to the Unit's figures which confirmed a shortage of 255 units in the Villages and Clusters tier, due to this and due to the proven need, it was considered there was justification for the units.

It was reported that all units were being proposed as affordable and in order to manage the affordable provision in planning policy terms, it was proposed to impose a standard condition that would require the applicant to comply with the affordable housing provision plan. It was noted that the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance confirmed the need for affordable housing within Villages to provide for the local need, namely people who needed an affordable house and who had lived in the Village or a surrounding rural village for a continuous period of five years or more; the Guidance also confirmed that a nearby rural area was defined as any Community Council that was 6km from the development site excluding properties within the development boundary of any settlement, other than the settlement within which the application was located.

A Welsh Language Statement was submitted with the application which had concluded that it was not expected that the proposed development would lead to any negative impacts on the Welsh language and was likely to have a minor beneficial impact given that this was a proposal for affordable homes for local people. The observations of the Welsh Language Unit on the development had been received and they were of the view that the proposal would have a minor positive impact on the Welsh language in the area.



It was noted that the objections received had noted that the Gwynedd Common Housing Allocations Policy did not consider the Welsh language, and therefore there could be no certainty what the impact of the development would be on the Welsh language. It was reiterated that the applicant's agent had provided information highlighting that 94% of the residents of Gwêl y Foel estate (a nearby housing development provided by Adra) were Welsh speakers (a percentage that was higher than the percentage for Llanwnda ward at 81%). Although objections had highlighted the concern about the allocations policy, the development would have to comply firstly with the planning permission that required the provision to be for local people. Consequently, it was not considered there was evidence that the proposal was likely to have a harmful impact on the Welsh Language.

It was considered that the design and finish of the houses was acceptable and appropriate for the area. It was reiterated that it was intended to landscape around the site and it was considered appropriate to receive the full details of the landscaping as a planning condition. The site had been designed to avoid significant detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties and it would not have a detrimental impact on the privacy or amenities of any nearby resident.

It was noted that there was an objection to intensifying the use of the access to the development located directly next door to the proposal, rather than using the access from the site to the A487. In response, it was necessary to consider the proposal on its own merits, and on the basis that using the access via the adjacent estate was acceptable to the Transportation Unit, there was no basis to consider any other option.

It was also noted that the proposal was subject to a Habitats Regulations Assessment and the Local Planning Authority (LPA) was the competent authority to undertake the assessment. Originally, it had been reported that Natural Resources Wales had confirmed that they had significant concerns about the increase in phosphate emissions from a sewage treatment works to afon Gwyrfai and the impact this could have on the river that was a Special Area of Conservation. By now, however, a review of the Welsh Water Environmental Permit for the discharge of treated water into afon Gwyrfai from Llanfaglan Sewage Treatment Works had taken place and a phosphorus limit had been implemented. Welsh Water confirmed that the Llanfaglan Sewage Treatment Works had capacity to process sewage from the proposal within its phosphorous limit and based on this information the Council's Biodiversity Unit (on behalf of the LPA) had reached the conclusion that the proposed development was unlikely to have a significant impact on afon Gwyrfai.

It was reported that Ecological and Trees Reports had been submitted as part of the planning application along with a green infrastructure statement, and they were considered acceptable subject to planning conditions.

In terms of education, the proposal would not lead to nearby schools exceeding their capacity and therefore a financial contribution would not be required. The proposal would also provide a play area with equipment that would contribute positively towards the shortage that had been highlighted in the area.

Having considered all relevant planning matters it was considered that the proposal was acceptable and it complied with the requirements of relevant local and national policies. The officers recommended approving the application with conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the officer representing Adra, noted the following observations:

- The proposal would provide 16 affordable homes that would meet Gwynedd's housing needs.
- The development was subject to grant support from Cyngor Gwynedd in response to the housing crisis.
- Phase one of Gwêl y Foel to construct 24 affordable homes had been completed with local people living in the houses.
- The proposal offered a good mix of housing.
- Adra had worked jointly with all consultees.
- The plans were acceptable.
- The officers recommended approving the proposal - the application complied with local and national policies.
- Information demonstrated that 94% of the residents of phase one of the Gwêl y Foel estate were Welsh speakers which was substantially more than the 81% in Llanwnda ward and 64% in the county.
- That phase one allocation policies had ensured that the tenants had a local connection to the ward.
- There was an urgent need for homes.

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

- The proposal responded to the need for affordable homes, but there was no evidence there would be no impact on the Welsh language in the local community.
- Accepted that phase one had been successful and welcomed this, but there was no evidence that phase two would be as successful - language use had not been assessed.
- Applicants could note numerous areas on their Housing Options application form and this therefore muddied the figures on need - the figures had to be robust.
- This was a case of making assumptions about a situation and there was no certainty.
- Concerned that the Gwynedd Common Housing Allocations Policy did not consider the Welsh language.
- There was a need to review the Housing Allocation Policy.
- Accepted that a language assessment had been submitted but it had been completed by the developer's agent. Did the agent have the relevant qualifications? It was a theoretical exercise.
- The Language Unit had submitted a short, unsubstantial assessment - no confidence in their comments as the information had not been convincingly weighed up.
- It was reasonable to consider the comments of Llanwnda Community Council which objected to the application on grounds that houses would be let under the Council's Common Housing Allocation Register which operated contrary to the Community Council's strategic aim of 'protecting and increasing the use of the Welsh language'.
- To ask the Committee to refuse the application on grounds of a lack of evidence of its impact on the Welsh language.

d) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application

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

- Although accepting the Local Member's comments, there was a need to consider the Cyngor Gwynedd Housing Strategy - local people needed housing.
- Adra had provided evidence that it was local people who lived in the houses.
- Although there was no guarantee of the impact on the Welsh language, the Council had a responsibility to provide housing for local people.

- Adra had a good record of supporting the Welsh language - of allocating houses to local Welsh-speakers.
  - Llanwnda Community Council had no evidence to support its statement.
  - The Allocation Policy was successful and prioritised housing for local people.
  - That phase one of Gwêl y Foel had a percentage of Welsh-speakers that was greater than the local percentage - the reason for this was that houses were being let to local people. Housing associations supported the language, the threat came from private housing.
  - The proposal would support local schools.
  - Although the impact on the Welsh language was not always clear in applications, it was clear here and it would strengthen the Welsh language.
  - Where else were local people supposed to live?!
  - There would be opportunities for occupants to learn Welsh - the main language of the local schools was Welsh.
  - There was no doubt of the need for housing locally - the intention was for it to be funded by Welsh Government.
- 
- The Welsh Language Commissioner (2019) had noted that the language assessment carried out on the Gwynedd Common Housing Allocations Policy did not comply with Welsh language standards.
  - There was missing data - the application should be refused based on Policy PS1.
  - There was a need to consider the number of births - young people were moving out of the County and there was no need for more housing, but nothing had changed - they were still developing.
  - There were no shops in the locality of the development. Which local school would it save?
  - The matter of satisfying communities had to be addressed. Lack of certainty in information - this needed improving.
  - Llanwnda Community Council had arranged a special meeting to discuss the matter - their concern was obvious. Had the Officers consulted with them? Discussions with local residents were crucial. Was Adra gathering opinions locally?
  - Dinas had reached its indicative growth level.
  - That 16 houses were too much for a relatively small section of land.

In response to the comments, the Assistant Head of Department noted that no evidence had been submitted that the proposal would harm the Welsh language, although evidence had been submitted to the contrary noting a positive impact. He reiterated that the proposal contributed to meeting the local need for housing met with the County's policies. He also noted that Officers consulted with communities and this was part of the statutory process.

**RESOLVED: TO APPROVE subject to the following conditions:-**

- 1. Five years.**
- 2. In accordance with the documents/plans submitted with the application.**
- 3. Natural slate.**
- 4. Samples of materials and colours for the houses to be agreed with the LPA.**
- 5. Highways Conditions.**
- 6. Soft and hard landscaping.**
- 7. Biodiversity and Tree Conditions including biodiversity enhancements and a habitats management plan.**
- 8. Working hours limited to 08:00 - 18:00 during the week, 08:00 - 12:00 on a Saturday and no working at all on Sundays and Bank Holidays.**

9. **Agree on details regarding Welsh names for the development together with advertising signage informing of and promoting the development within and outside the site.**
10. **Ensure a plan/arrangement to provide the affordable units.**
11. **Removal of general development rights for the affordable units.**
12. **Submit a Construction Method Statement including parking provision for the builders' vehicles.**
13. **Submit outdoor lighting details to be agreed with the LPA prior to installation.**
14. **Archaeological mitigation measures condition.**
15. **Provide and safeguard the open space for the future**
16. **Welsh Water Condition**
17. **Public protection conditions (Noise, Dust, Nuisance)**
18. **Construction environmental management plan**
19. **Details of PV solar panels on the roofs of the houses and the air source heat pumps.**
20. **Welsh language signs.**

Notes: Welsh Water, Highways, SUDS

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

---

CHAIR