
PLANNING COMMITTEE 15 June 2026

Attendance: Chair: Cllr Huw Rowlands
Vice-chair: Cllr Edgar Owen

Councillors:

Elwyn Edwards, Delyth Lloyd Griffiths, Louise Hughes, Gareth T Jones, Anne Lloyd Jones, Cai Larsen, Dafydd Meurig, Gareth Coj Parry, John Pughe Roberts, Dyfrig Siencyn and Gruffydd Williams.

Local Member: Councillor Gwilym Evans

Officers: Ivan Evans (Head of Legal Services - Monitoring Officer), Gareth Jones (Assistant Head of Environment), Gwawr Hughes (Planning Manager), Elan Mared Lloyd (Senior Planning Officer), Elen Charles Morris (Planning Officer), Rhys Cadwaladr (Senior Minerals and Waste Planning Officer), Dafydd Jones (Legal) and Lowri Haf Evans (Democracy Services Officer).

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Elin Hywel and Councillor Berwyn Parry Jones; Cllr Llio Elenid Owen (Local Member application 5.7)

Cllr Dyfrig Siencyn was welcomed as a new member of the Committee.

2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST AND PROTOCOL MATTERS

- a) Councillor Cai Larsen declared an interest in item 5.2 (C25/0671/14/LL) as he was on the Board of Governors of Ysgol Syr Hugh Owen. The Member believed that it was a prejudicial interest and he therefore withdrew from the Chamber during the discussion on the application.
- b) Iwan Evans (Head of Legal Services – Monitoring Officer) declared an interest in item 5.1 (C26/0238/15/LL) as his brother was the relevant architect. The officer was of the opinion that it was a prejudicial interest, and he left the Chamber during the discussion on the application.
- c) The following Member declared that he was a local member in relation to the item noted:

Councillor Gwilym Evans (who was not a Member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.1 (C26/0238/15/LL) on the agenda.

The following Member declared that he was representing the Local Member in relation to the item noted:

Councillor Gareth Williams (who was not a Member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 C25/0777/39/LL on the agenda.

3. URGENT ITEMS

None to note

4. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 18 May 2026, as a true record.

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

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

5.1 APPLICATION NUMBER : C26/0238/15/LL Land near 10 Warden Street, Llanberis

Erection of new dwelling

- a) The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that it was a full application for the erection of a family dwelling of a detached two-storey design, with the gable end of the property facing the public road; the proposed house would be of a modern pitched roof design built into the slope. It would measure approximately 7.2m high to the highest point of the roof, with a balcony on a substantial terrace being installed to the rear of the property which would extend out approximately 2.5m and serve the floor.

An application for a single property on this site (26.02.2026) under reference C25/0927/15/LL had been refused. Although some amendments had been made to the plans of the current application, including the removal of two first-floor openings that faced the property next door and reducing the size of the balcony so that it did not extend out past the house's side elevation, the size and layout of the property generally continued to be the same in terms of size and scale.

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee for a decision at the Local Member's request.

Reference was made to Policy TAI 15 of the Local Development Plan (LDP) which stated that Councils would seek to ensure an appropriate level of affordable housing in the plan area. Two or more housing units was the threshold, and as only one unit was proposed in this case, Policy TAI 15 was not relevant in this case, and it was not necessary to provide an affordable element.

Policy PCYFF 3 required developments to offer a design of high-quality that respected and assimilated with the character and context of the area. In this case, it was considered that the proposed house did not reflect the traditional design of the adjacent terraced houses on Warden Street. Although the design had been modified somewhat since the previous application, its bulk, height and more contemporary features continued to appear disproportionate and out of character with the local environment. In addition, as the site was on a slope, the dwelling would sit higher than the surrounding houses and therefore stand out in the landscape. As a result, it was considered that the building would create an oppressive effect and would not naturally blend into the streetscape or the surrounding landscape. The proposal therefore did not add to or enhance the character or appearance of the area, and was contrary to the requirements of policy PCYFF 3. Although some materials attempted to refer to the historic landscape, it was considered that a more sensitive design for the site could be submitted.

In terms of residential amenities, significant concerns were raised about the impact of the development on neighbouring properties. Although the proposed balcony had been reduced, it remained a prominent feature at the rear of the property and was likely to cause over-looking and privacy issues – these risks particularly affected residents of the neighbouring chapel and No. 10 Warden Street.

In addition, it was considered that the location and layout of the property meant that movements in and out of the new house would take place in a narrow gap near No. 10, rather than towards the street like the rest of the houses. This would create a sense of oppression and negatively impact the residential amenities of that property. As a result, the proposal was considered to have an unacceptable impact on nearby residents and was therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy PCYFF 2.

The proposed biodiversity improvements were considered to meet the requirements of policies PS19 and AMG5 and Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales. The SUDS application had been submitted and approved – the proposal was acceptable and complied with the requirements of TAN 15.

It was explained that the property would provide a family home for a local person from the village and therefore it was not considered that it would be detrimental to the Welsh language. It was noted that conditions could be imposed, if the application was granted, to ensure a Welsh name for the dwelling; the proposal complied with the requirements of policy PS 1.

The Planning Officers recommended that the application be refused as the modern design of the proposed dwelling, with the extensive balcony and glazed doors/windows on the front and rear elevations, did not respect the character of neighbouring houses or that which was in the vicinity - the features would be incompatible. The proposal would not complement nor enhance the character and appearance of the site or area. Full consideration had not been given to its historical and built context and that its layout, appearance, scale, height, mass and treatment of the elevations contained incongruous, dominant and alien features that did not respect the context of the streetscape or site. The proposal was therefore considered contrary to criteria 1, 2 and 3 of Policy PCYFF 3:

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant noted the following observations:
- That he was brought up in Llanberis.
 - Several efforts had been made to submit an application and discuss with officers.
 - Accepted that the design was modern, but there was a need to move with the times - not everyone wanted a quarry house.
 - Several new, bold houses had been built in the village - some on the old Library site - these were modern, and it could be argued that they did not suit the surrounding area.
 - Design inconsistencies throughout the village.
 - The house would not have an impact on the flats as they were located at ground level.
 - An Airbnb was on the first floor of the flats - therefore, was there a priority over local people?
 - The SUDS application had been approved.
 - The application was within the development boundary of the village.

- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the Local Member made the following comments:
- That he was speaking on behalf of the Community Council which was supportive of the application.
 - While he welcomed recent new housing to the village it could be argued that they did not suit the surrounding area.
 - There were no objections locally and neighbours were in favour of the application.
 - There was a real need for housing in the village – several had been sold and were now used as Airbnbs or second homes – welcomed this as an opportunity for a local family to stay in the village.
 - Urged the committee to approve with possible conditions.
- ch) It was proposed and seconded to defer so that further discussions could be held with the applicant, and a site visit could take place so that the Committee could consider the issues in more detail.

RESOLVED: To defer in order to undertake a site visit.

5.2 APPLICATION NUMBER C25/0671/14/LL Ysgol Syr Hugh Owen, Ffordd Bethel, Caernarfon

Erect a new 2400mm high fence around part of the playing field boundary.

- a) The Senior Planning Officer stated that it was a full application for the erection of a fence around part of the playing field boundary at Ysgol Syr Hugh Owen.

The application was submitted to the Planning Committee because the Local Member had declared an interest and provided comments on the application.

It was highlighted that comments from the statutory and public consultation mostly referred to concerns arising from neighbours stating that it was an unnecessary development creating a visual impact, an impact on residential amenities and a human rights impact. A letter had also been received supporting the fence because there were problems with stones being thrown, trespassing on private property and litter being thrown into gardens.

Reference was made to Policy ISA 2, which relates to community facilities, including schools, and states that the LDP will assist in the maintenance and improvement of community facilities. The proposal would be located on the boundaries of an existing school, and the fence would be needed around the building to improve security within the school grounds. In terms of principle, the proposal was considered to be reasonable and in line with the principle of Policy ISA 2 of the LDP.

The proposed fence would be a green "weldmesh", which is a see-through fence and therefore it was considered that it would not create a closed or oppressive view of the school or the surrounding houses. As it was in keeping with the existing school fencing and allowed visibility, it was considered that it would not create a visual impact in the area, and it therefore complied with policy PCYFF 3.

It was reported that some neighbouring residents had objected on the grounds of visual impact and oppressive feeling, but it was noted that fencing of this type was common in schools to protect staff and pupils. As similar fencing already existed around the site, the proposal was consistent with the environment. The new fence would be approximately 4–5 metres from the rear of the houses, providing an adequate gap so that it did not have a significant impact on private amenities. It was reiterated that consideration had to be given to the need to protect pupils and school grounds as well as the land outside the school from damage, and on balance it was considered that this type of fence would not cause significant harm to the amenities of the local neighbourhood, and therefore it complied with Policy PCYFF 2 of the LDP. In addition, it was highlighted that trees had a protection order along the boundary with a condition to be imposed to ensure that no work on the trees was carried out without prior permission – this would protect the trees as part of the development.

The proposal did not meet the thresholds for the submission of a Welsh Language Statement or a Welsh Language Impact Assessment Report; however it was not considered to be detrimental to the Welsh language and therefore it complied with the requirements of Policy PS 1.

It was considered that the planning matters had been addressed in full with some comments referring to operational matters. The land ownership certificate was not considered to be incorrect, as the applicant was acting on behalf of the School and the Council, and the content of certain documents submitted was not considered to be incorrect or defective. It was reiterated that it was a matter for the applicant to contact neighbouring landowners and there was no obligation to do this under the Planning system.

It was considered that the proposal was acceptable and complied with the relevant policies. It was recommended to approve the proposal with conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an objector to the application made the following observations:
- Whilst accepting that the observation was outside the planning process, the Prescription Act 1832 allowed a right of way by prescription if there had been uninterrupted use for 40 years; it was an insurmountable right, an absolute one, which could not be defeated, that there had been evidence of uninterrupted use for over 40 years by several property owners so installing the fence would be a breach of law.
 - Para 5.3 of the report stated, "The new fence will separate the gardens of the neighbouring houses from the school playing field, and the fence will be approximately 4 to 5 metres away from the rear of the houses in question. We therefore believe that this area between the rear of the houses and the fence is sufficient not to create a significant negative and adverse impact on the private amenities of the owners of those houses". There was no information indicating that there were already fences and walls separating the gardens of neighbouring houses and the school's playing field.
 - A site visit by a planning case officer provided the necessary physical context to evaluate a planning application, allowing the officer to assess the impact on

neighbouring properties taking into account the visual impact, and understand the local character, which was essential before making a recommendation to the Committee. It would be interesting to know whether the case officer had carried out a detailed inspection of the site and more pertinently from where that inspection was carried out.

- To properly evaluate this proposal and to understand why several objections were received, the officer who expressed objections would have to visit the properties that had expressed objections to see the impact that the proposed fence would have, before making a decision on the recommendation. Strongly argued that a recommendation could not be brought to the Committee without considering the impact of installing a fence on a property i.e. the effect of looking up at the fence and a sense of being closed in. Assuming that an assessment by an officer who had either not visited the site or that only a visit from field level was carried out - unaware of a request by an officer for permission to enter a property to carry out an assessment, which was surprising!
- Given the topography of the land, the fence would be more or less at the height of the first floor of several properties. The fence would be a prominent feature that would have an oppressive and unsympathetic effect on the property, resulting in a sense of being shut in and a significant loss of amenity. When looking up from a back door at a fence, the top of the fence would be about 5 metres higher than where someone is standing, quoting from the report "approximately 4 to 5 metres away from the back of the houses".
- The difference in level between the field and several of the properties was obvious. There was no reference to these different levels in the report – this information was important and argued that it should be considered intensively before reaching a decision.
- Confirmed his objection along with the objections of many other residents to allow the installation of a fence due to a significant negative and adverse impact on the private amenities of owners – an unnecessary fence given that walls and fencing already existed on the site between the school grounds and properties.

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

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

RESOLVED: To defer in order to undertake a site visit.

5.3 APPLICATION C26/0057/33/RC Part of field near Penboncyn, Boduan, Pwllheli, LL53 6DR

Re-submission of an application previously refused to revoke a 106 agreement relating to the erection of an affordable house permitted under reference C10D/0017/33/LL on part of a field near Penboncyn, Boduan, Pwllheli.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that it was an application to revoke a 106 agreement attached to planning permission in 2010 which ensured that the property would be an affordable unit with a discount of at least 40%. The application had been submitted as the current owners did not consider the house to be an affordable house, even at a discounted rate due to its financial value. It was noted that the property had not been constructed, but that work in connection with the planning permission, including the entrance, had

commenced and therefore the planning permission was extant. The property, if built in accordance with the permitted plans, would be a single-story detached house with 4 bedrooms and a living room located within the Boduan rural area which was well outside any current development boundary, and therefore in open countryside.

From a planning history perspective, the original applicant's application (not the current applicants) had been assessed and the need for affordable housing was proven. However, the size of the property was significantly larger than usual for a 4-bedroom affordable house and therefore, the recommendation made by officers then was to refuse the application. The application was discussed at the planning committee at the time and members had resolved to go contrary to the recommendation and approve the application subject to the completion of a 106 agreement. It was reiterated that Boduan was no longer defined as a rural village and therefore, the site was in the open countryside in terms of the relevant planning consideration.

It was noted that a previous application for the revocation of the 106 had been refused under delegated rights and the application had been submitted to the planning committee for a decision at the local member's request.

Reference was made to the procedure for assessing the revocation of 106 agreements, the specific criteria and that the agreement remained relevant – the agreement for ensuring that the unit was affordable in perpetuity. The site was originally in a location directly near a building coloured on the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan proposals map, which defined Boduan as a Rural Village and, therefore, without complying with an affordable housing policy at the time it would not have been granted planning permission in the first place. It was reiterated that the need for affordable units in the area of Boduan continued and surrounding areas which had been evidenced by the comments of the Housing Strategic Unit. There was no other means of ensuring that the unit was affordable and therefore the agreement was considered to remain relevant.

It was highlighted that information submitted as part of the application referred to valuation, but had not been included, and that the applicants considered that the price was too high to be affordable and therefore available to those who would be eligible for it. It was noted that the area's estimated affordable house price was £126,315 using the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance formula, but the maximum gross household income threshold for households in the assessment criteria for affordable need had increased from £45k to £60k due to rising house prices meaning more people were falling within the affordable housing need threshold. It was therefore considered that people who were eligible for affordable housing could reach this price.

It was noted that the house had not yet been built, and therefore there was an opportunity to look at ways of changing its size and design to reduce its value, e.g., the floor area to comply with space requirements set out in the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. It was also noted that it was not entirely clear what the applicants needed and if there was a real need for a 4-bedroom property.

Should the Local Planning Authority consider that the 106 was no longer acceptable or reasonable, paragraph 3.9.1 of the Affordable Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance confirmed that there may be circumstances in which the existing affordable units did not provide an affordable unit, even at the reduced rate, the Council may consider cancelling the agreement provided that a commuted sum was paid to contribute to the future provision of affordable housing i.e. the difference between the reduced value and the open market

value. It was noted that the applicants in this case considered that this sum would be unreasonable, but it was emphasised that this was the mechanism of securing affordable units through the Scheme and was therefore required if the proposal to revoke the 106 was acceptable.

Having regard to the information submitted as part of the application and the assessment completed, it was considered that an agreement under Section 106 continued to meet the relevant tests and continued to fulfil a useful planning purpose because they were relevant to the property, and as a means of ensuring that the property remained an affordable unit in the first place and in perpetuity. It was reiterated that the legal agreement was a means of ensuring that the LDP's current policies, as well as national policies and guidelines, were not undermined. It was considered that this proposal would undermine policies PCYFF 1 and TAI 15 of the LDP together with Supplementary Planning Guidance: Affordable Housing, Supplementary Planning Guidance: Planning Obligations and Technical Advice Note 2: Planning and Affordable Housing. The recommendation was to refuse to remove the 106 agreement.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following observations:
- It was a resubmitted application to revoke a section 106 agreement attached to a previous planning permission.
 - The original permission had been granted in 2011 for a single-storey affordable dwelling – the applicants at the time had been assessed and confirmed as in need of affordable housing.
 - However, the approved dwelling significantly exceeded what was expected for a 4-bedroom affordable dwelling – the application had been approved by the committee contrary to officers' recommendation.
 - At the time, the commitment set out a clear purpose, however now the planning policy and circumstances of ownership of the site had changed significantly – the site was now owned by a Welsh-speaking family.
 - The context of the policy had progressed under the LDP – Boduan was no longer within the development boundary and was considered in open countryside – generally, new dwellings were not supported and by today, an affordable dwelling in this location would not correspond with the current policy.
 - The dwelling was not truly affordable – well above the floor area guide for an affordable 4-bedroom home.
 - Located within a generous curtilage in attractive countryside – factors that increased its value.
 - Evidence of a valuation of £425,000 and even with a required discount of 40% the sale price would be around £255,000. An affordable house in this area was closer to £151,000 - reduced value remained over £100,00 than what could be considered as an affordable house price.
 - Commuted sum requirement was excessive and unreasonable – a commuted sum for one dwelling was not fair in scale and nature of the development.
 - Evidence about the need for local housing did not clearly support retaining the restriction. It was doubtful whether these particular properties would meet the local need in a meaningful way.
 - The commitment no longer served a useful planning purpose.
 - It no longer reflected current policy or supported a home that was truly affordable.
- c) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- The site was outside the development boundary and in open countryside.
 - What was wrong with getting an affordable house in a countryside site?
 - Permission had been granted contrary to the recommendation because of the 106 element and therefore it would be important to keep the house as affordable.
 - 6 were on the Tai Teg list and 27 were on the waiting list, so it would be important to keep it as a 106 property.
 - The buyers of the house had been aware that it had a 106.

RESOLVED: To refuse

Reason:

It is considered that the Section 106 Agreement that restricts the property to an affordable house for local need continues to serve a relevant purpose for planning use, and therefore, that it continues to secure necessary use in accordance with the guidance provided in 'Planning Obligations' Community Infrastructure Levy 2010 and Circular 13/97, Planning Policy Wales, Chapter 3 "Making and Enforcing Planning Decisions" and the Town and Country Planning (Modification and Discharge of Planning Obligations) Act 1992. Removing the agreement as noted in the application would also undermine the Council's strategy in relation to safeguarding an acceptable number of affordable houses within the county, which would be contrary to the relevant requirements of Policies PCYFF 1 and TAI 15 of the Joint Anglesey and Gwynedd Local Development Plan, 2017 together with relevant guidelines in Supplementary Planning Guidance: Affordable Housing, Supplementary Planning Guidance: Planning Obligations and Technical Advice Note 2: Planning and Affordable Housing.

5.4 APPLICATION NUMBER C25/0777/39/LL Fferm Sarn, Lôn Sarn Bach, Sarn Bach, Pwllheli, Gwynedd

Full application to demolish an existing dwelling (C3 use) and construction of a new replacement dwelling (C3 use) with improvements to an existing access.

- a) The Planning Manager highlighted that the proposal entailed the demolition of an existing empty building (which had clearly retained its status as a residential property) and the erection of a 4-bedroom, two-storey building partially over the footprint of the existing property but would be slightly higher. It was explained that the site was located within the development boundary of the village of Sarn Bach with a parallel class 3 public road and a public footpath leading off the road through the site. It was added that an existing vehicular entrance led past the gable of the property serving the site and was access to an established camping and touring caravan site attached to the property to the rear of the main building. The neighbouring buildings were to some extent a mix in design and finishes, but all included common features in form and finishes such as slate roofs and a finish of natural stone and render.

The application was submitted to the Committee for a decision at the Local Member's request.

In the context of the principle of the development, policy TAI 13 (demolition and re-erection of houses) was considered, highlighting that policy TAI 5 was not relevant because the existing property, considering its delegated rights to extend, was beyond the requirements of the policy. It was noted that the proposal complied with the requirements of policy TAI 13

and that there was no objection to the principle of demolishing the property and erecting another in its place.

However, it was considered that the proposed property, due to its design, finishes and scale would completely change the character of the site and attract the eye to an unacceptable degree. It would not respect its site context and location within the village. It was recognised that various examples of development had been permitted within the area, but that each application had to be considered on its own merit – in this case, it was not considered that the proposal had entirely succeeded in enhancing the character and appearance of the site as the design would create a much more prominent feature and would not integrate or contribute positively to the local streetscape and the development pattern of the surrounding area. The view was supported by the observations of the AONB Unit. It was accepted that an effort had been made to change the design of the property, but it was not possible to overcome all the concerns in terms of visual impact and impact on the AONB. To this end, the proposal conflicted with the relevant requirements of policies PCYFF 2, PCYFF 3 and AMG 1 of the LDP together with the advice of Technical Advice Note 12.

Reference was made to matters regarding residential amenities, transport, language and biodiversity, noting that they were acceptable.

The proposal was considered unacceptable in its submitted form as it failed to meet the requirements of relevant policies and guidelines. The officers recommended that the application be refused.

b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following observations:

- The intention was to demolish an old farmhouse and build a new house in its place – no legal restrictions – the value of the existing house was well above the threshold of what was considered affordable housing for a local person.
- The applicants were a local Welsh-speaking family who intended to move from their farm in Cilan and retire to their Fferm Sarn property, to live and run the farm and their caravan park.
- The farmhouse in Cilan would be released for rent to a local family.
- The house was in poor condition. This had been confirmed by a structural engineer.
- The property had been vacant for 20 years.
- A 'Viability Assessment' proved that it would not be economical to renovate the house and that demolition was the solution. The principle of demolishing was not an issue.
- It was not listed or located within a conservation area. There were no architectural features to the property.
- It was within the local development boundary.
- Good design – there was an intention to use traditional materials in the rebuild.
- Officers were concerned about the size and scale of the design.
- Permitted Developments Rights (PDR) could allow the size of a house to be expanded without planning permission.
- The 30m2 proposal was less than PDR requirements - therefore, it could be argued that it was not too large for the area; the size had however been reduced following discussions.
- No objections from the Community Council or neighbours.
- It was proposed to rebuild slightly away from the road to improve the access, visibility and safety of public footpath users.
- More economical to demolish and rebuild a house within the development boundary.

c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, a member from a neighbouring ward noted the following observations (on behalf of the Local Member):

- It was not unusual to see a house being demolished and rebuilt in this area, but it was different here as a local family was submitting the application and not an applicant from across the border.
- Three generations of the same family had farmed at Fferm Sarn. The applicant currently lived on a neighbouring farm in Cilan but wanted to retire from farming and run the caravan park that already existed at Fferm Sarn. He intended to rent the farm in Cilan to a young local family.
- The house had been vacant for 15 years and was in a poor condition.
- A Structural Report had highlighted that a lot of work would be required to bring a building up to standard and therefore the best option would be to demolish and rebuild.
- Despite the collaboration and discussion with officers about changes to the plan to use the old slates of the house, adjust the size of the windows, reduce the size of the property's footprint and reuse of stones, it was disappointing that the officers were recommending to refuse the application.
- The Community Council had not objected to the application.
- The reasons for refusing were weak - they related to design, which was a matter of personal opinion. This was an ordinary house compared to the mansions in Abersoch.
- The applicant was entitled to maintain the existing footprint under Planning Permission: Development Rights, without planning permission.
- It was intended to create a new, larger entrance to improve safety for cars, caravans and public footpath users.
- This was not a new house – it complied with the requirements of policy TAI 13.
- Conversion of an empty house into a home. A great opportunity to use a dormant, unkempt house to a tidy, comfortable, energy efficient house.
- Asked the Committee to grant the application.

ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application, contrary to the recommendation. Reason: Design was a matter of opinion – this was acceptable given the diverse architecture of this particular area.

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

- The Community Council did not object to the application.
- It would bring an empty house back into use.
- It was intended to move the property further back from the road.
- The applicant was within his rights to build a larger house.
- There were improvements here too – creating a safer access with better visibility – that were favourable to pedestrians and drivers.
- There was a need to move with the times.
- Houses of modern design and good quality should be supported – perhaps too strict with design rules.
- The house did not suit the area – too different from the original house.
- Design was a matter of opinion – while demolition and rebuilding would be acceptable, designs suitable for the area must be ensured. AONB comments needed to be considered.

In response to a question as to which design elements had been considered for this development, it was noted that the location, size, appearance, window pattern and balance of the design elements had been considered. Accepted that this was a matter of opinion, but it was the view of the local planning authority that the proposal was unacceptable in the submitted form.

RESOLVED To approve, contrary to the recommendation.

- 1. 5 years**
- 2. In accordance with the plans.**
- 3. Finish and slates on the roof.**
- 4. Archaeology condition - archive record.**
- 5. Biodiversity enhancements.**

5.5 APPLICATION NUMBER C25/0344/11/LL 219 - 231 High Street, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57 1NY

Proposed development for the change of use of the former Waterloo Inn Public House (A3 use) and part of the former WH Smiths & USC units (ancillary A1 use) to form 13 self-contained residential flats (C3 use) along with internal alterations and reconfiguration to combine two existing retail units to provide stalls for retail purposes on the ground floor.

- a) The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that it was a full application for a property located within the boundary of the Sub-Regional Centre and therefore the principle of developing the site had to be considered against Policy TAI 1 of the LDP. It was reported that the indicative housing supply level for Bangor over the LDP period was 969 units. During the period between 2011 and 2025, it was noted that a total of 821 units had been completed in the city and the windfall land bank i.e. sites with extant planning permission on sites not designated for housing, stood at 164 units in April 2025. While the provision was already being addressed through the sites in the land bank, in such circumstances consideration would be given to the units that had been completed thus far within the Main Centres tier. Policy PS 17 of the LDP stated that 53% of housing growth would be located within the Sub-Regional Centre and Urban Service Centres with a shortfall of 135 units in terms of windfall provision within this tier.

By adding 13 residential units to the housing stock, this development would help to contribute towards the LDP's housing targets in a way that responded positively to the requirements of the local housing market and, therefore, it was believed that the proposal could be accepted under TAI 1 and PS 17 of the LDP. It was noted that Policy TAI 9 of the LDP approved the sub-division of existing properties into self-contained flats provided they conformed to a number of criteria discussed in the report. It was believed that the proposal was acceptable based on the requirements of Policy TAI 9.

Reference was made to the Housing Mix assessment, which was part of the Welsh Language Impact Assessment submitted, which noted that the projections of the Gwynedd Local Housing Market Assessment 2018-2023 showed a continuous growth in the number of 1 and 2 people households against a consistent shortage of suitable property. It was highlighted that the assessment indicated that while there was good provision for the student accommodation market in Bangor, there was a significant shortage in the young professionals' market for high-quality units. It was considered that sufficient evidence had

been submitted that there was a local demand for the size and type of units proposed here and, therefore, that the housing mix was appropriate and complied with policy TAI 8.

The site was located in a mixed-use area, which included residential uses as well as commercial and business uses. It was not considered that there would be a significant impact on the residential amenities of nearby properties in terms of over-looking or loss of privacy. Following a conversation with the Conservation Officer and amendments to the plans, it was concluded that the development would not be detrimental to the built quality of the Conservation Area and therefore, it was acceptable under policy AT 1. While concerns had been raised by the Public Protection Service regarding the potential impact of noise on residents, it was noted that ensuring adequate insulation was a matter for Building Control. Given the mixed nature of the area, it was not considered that general noise levels were unacceptable, and any incidents of unusual noise would be treated as a nuisance; it was considered that the proposal was acceptable in terms of residential amenities and complied with policies PCYFF 2, PCYFF 3 and TAI 9 of the LDP.

Although there was no provision for on-site parking, the proposal was considered acceptable given its central location, accessibility to alternative transport and adjacent parking provision and therefore, it complied with policies TRA 2 and TRA 4. The building was located in Bangor City centre and within a site that could be described as sustainable; Bangor bus station was within a 5 minute walk of the site with a frequent public transport service, shops were within comfortable walking distance of the site and the train station was approximately 10-15 minutes walking distance which was also served by public transport and taxis; the proposal complied with the requirements of Policies PS 4 and PS 5 of the LDP.

Reference was made to Policy TAI 15 which assessed the provision of affordable housing for developments of two or more units in Bangor, and in this case, three affordable units out of a total of 13 would be required. However, given the size and value of the flats, their prices were not expected to rise out of the reach of local residents and all the flats would be "affordable by design", but it was noted that there was an intention to impose a condition to ensure three affordable units in case there was a change in market values, in compliance with Policy TAI 15.

With the development being one for more than 10 living units, a Language Impact Assessment was submitted to support the application. It was considered that the proposal would have a neutral linguistic effect, by meeting local demand for flats and the needs of the community. With appropriate conditions, it was considered that the application would meet the requirements of Policy PS 1 of the LDP.

The site was located within the boundary of Bangor City Centre and the Main Shopping Area and national and local policies seek to protect and enhance the vitality and viability of town centres and their retail, service and social functions. In this case, commercial use would continue on the ground floor, retaining an active front facing shop window. It was not considered that the development would undermine the role of the Town Centre as it would carry out business activity that would contribute to the viability of the high street; the application was acceptable under the requirements of policies PS 15, MAN 1 and MAN 2 as they related to the protection of the role of town centre retail.

It was considered that the proposed use was acceptable and would not impair the area's character or cause unacceptable harm to amenities. It was recommended that the application be approved with conditions.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- c) Taking advantage of the right to speak, an agent on behalf of the applicant noted the following observations:
- The flats responded to the need for self-sufficient dwellings.
 - The retail units and pub had been marketed since 2022 - there had been no interest or viewings to the pub.
 - It would be good to get the building back into use - it would add to the vibrancy of the high street and the city centre.
 - The proposal offered 1-, 2- and 3-bedroom mixed units.
 - Good links with employment, amenities, shops and public transport.
 - Three affordable units were proposed in accordance with policy requirements.
 - Multi-agency units would not be self-sustaining.
 - It would meet the need for housing locally.
 - The retail units on the ground floor would be smaller and affordable.
 - A local consultation had been carried out - there were no objections to the proposal, subject to conditions.
 - Research had been received which examined the loss of community properties and large retail units.
 - A positive investment for the city.
- ch) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by Members:
- Disappointed that an iconic pub was closing in the County.
 - The high street was fast becoming a street of bed-sits.
 - The proposal was an acceptable use of a vacant building – flats and protected a retail site.
 - There was a need to regenerate the High Street.

In response to a question about a lack of response again from Bangor City Council, the Assistant Head of Department stated that he had contacted Bangor City Council directly noting the Committee's concern that the City Council was not offering a response to planning applications in the city. He highlighted that he had not received a response to his request and added that while there were no legal implications for offering comments, he stated that if the Committee wished him to contact again, that he would be happy to do so.

In response to a question about concerns that there was insufficient information in the report about the pub's viability, and it was sad to see another pub closing in the County, it was noted that the pub had closed since 2022 and that evidence of the pub's marketing had been included in the report.

In response to a question regarding black plates (x5) which appeared to provide structure and maintenance to the building, it was noted that the application did not state that they were retained or not, but that this would be an issue to be considered as a safety issue by building control.

RESOLVED: To approve subject to conditions:

- 1. Time - Five years.**
- 2. In accordance with the plans.**
- 3. Restrict the use class to C3 residential dwellings only.**
- 4. Restrict the construction hours.**

5. **The objectives of the Green Infrastructure Statement must be implemented.**
6. **Affordable housing condition**
7. **Welsh name**

Note:

Welsh Water

Assistant Head of Department to contact Bangor City Council again.

5.6 APPLICATION NUMBER C26/0046/34/LL Cefn Graianog, Llanllyfni, Caernarfon, Gwynedd, LL54 6SY

Application for operation of work to recycle, screen and recover inert waste materials.

Attention was drawn to the Late Observations Form which stated that the AONB had no objection.

- a) The Senior Minerals Officer highlighted that the intention was to recycle and recover inert waste through physical processes such as screening, to produce secondary aggregates in line with WRAP standards. The activities would take place on the existing hard standing and would be similar in nature to the site's current work. Materials would be transported through the existing road network, and water would be recycled on-site through a lagoon system, without discharging it off the site. The hours and conditions of operation would remain the same as those already established for the quarry.

It was explained that the application had been screened under Environmental Impact Assessment regulations and it was considered that the development was unlikely to have significant impacts, and therefore there was no need to submit an Environmental Statement.

In the context of the principle of the application, it was noted that the site had already been designated for waste management under Policy GWA 1 and was therefore acceptable. The proposal would include the treatment of up to 50,000 tonnes per year through physical processes alone, to produce recycled aggregates and materials; assessments had shown that there would be no significant impacts on the environment or local amenities. It was noted that national and local policies supported sustainable waste management, provided there were no adverse impacts on the environment or the amenities of residents. In this case, the assessments indicated that there would be no significant impacts in terms of landscape, environment or amenities. It was reiterated that the application was supported by a Waste Planning Assessment which highlighted the need for the facility, particularly to process material from dredging, and enabled the site to diversify its activities. Overall, the intention was to support the circular economy by reducing waste and the need for new materials, and it was therefore considered a sustainable form of development that complied with the relevant policies of PS 21, GWA 1 of the LDP and Technical Advice Note 21.

In the context of Visual Amenities and the landscape, it was noted that the application had been assessed against policies PCYFF 3 and PCYFF 4, which related to the impact of developments on landscape character and visual amenity, together with policies MWYN 3 and MWYN 9, which related to mineral developments and restoration. In this case, it was noted that the development was located within an operational quarry and the existing processing area, with no extension to the site's footprint and that the only physical change was a relatively low boundary along the site boundaries. It was added that the processing machinery was already present and smaller in scale than the existing mineral activity and

therefore would not present a significant new visual impact. It was stated that the assessments confirmed that there would be no unacceptable impact on the wider landscape or adjacent sensitive designations, as well as the development being limited to the life of the quarry and restored in accordance with the requirements of policy MWYN 9 and therefore the visual and landscape impacts of the proposed would be limited and acceptable, and complied with policies PCYFF 3, PCYFF 4, MWYN 3 and MWYN 9.

When considering General and Residential Amenities, it was reported that the proposal related to recycling and screening inert waste which was very similar to the current operations of the Cefn Graianog site and had been subject to management through planning conditions and environmental permits. Although the mineral policies were not directly relevant, it was noted that they provided clear guidance that unacceptable impacts on residents in terms of noise, dust and general amenities should be avoided. In this case, there were no sensitive properties within 100 metres, and the site was already operating under strict management arrangements; the intention was to impose the same operating control measures, and no objection had been received from the Public Protection Service. As a result, it was not considered that the development would have an adverse impact on local amenities and therefore complied with policies PCYFF 2 and GWA 1.

In the context of matters regarding Traffic, Public Rights of Way and Common Land, it was clarified that the proposal did not involve any changes to the existing access, and an increase in the number of transport movements was not expected, as the traffic would likely balance out the existing mineral activity. The local road network was considered suitable to cope with the traffic flow, and no adverse impact on public rights of way was foreseen; the proposal was acceptable from a transport perspective and complied with policies PS 4 and TRA 4.

In terms of ecological matters, it was noted that the applicant had submitted a Green Infrastructure Statement which followed a step-by-step approach to reduce the impact on biodiversity. The Biodiversity Unit did not object to the application and considered the statement acceptable. The development had been assessed under the Habitats Regulations and although the site was close to the Corsydd Eifionydd Special Area of Conservation and an adjacent Site of Special Scientific Interest, it was noted that the works were located outside these sites without hydrological or physical connection, and therefore there would be no direct loss of habitat and the water and dust management measures would reduce any further risks. As a result, and in line with NRW's advice, it was considered that there would be no adverse impact on the whole of the SAC and the proposal complied with PS 19, AMG 3, AMG 5 and GWA 1.

When considering Hydrology and Hydrogeology, it was highlighted that a small part of the site was in a flood risk zone, but also that an enclosed lagoon system had been designed to manage all water on the site as a self-sustaining system that would support the existing arrangements. It was not considered that the use of the system would have a significant impact on the flood risk. It was added that neither NRW nor the Lead Local Flood Authority had raised concerns, and it was not considered that the development would increase the flood risk and it therefore complied with Technical Advice Note 15.

In the context of heritage matters, as the development would use an existing hardstanding within the processing yard and there would be no impact on previously undisturbed land, no impact on archaeological interests was expected. Although listed monuments were within 350m of the site, Cadw had no objection and therefore the proposal complied with Policy PS 20.

In accordance with Policy PS 1, a Welsh Language Statement had been submitted. The application was expected to maintain the existing local workforce and support the use of Welsh in the workplace and based on the nature of the development it was not considered that there would be a negative impact on the Welsh language. It was added that the Language and Scrutiny Unit had submitted comments agreeing with this assessment, and it therefore complied with Policy PS 1 and the relevant guidance.

It was highlighted that Technical Advice Note 23 emphasised the need to consider the economic benefits of all developments and supported sustainable growth in the appropriate locations. The proposal to expand operations at Cefn Graianog Quarry, which would maintain and potentially improve local employment, would support the Welsh language and the viability of the community. As a result, the development was considered to make a positive contribution to the area's economy and complied with policies PS 5, PS 13 and TAN 23.

The officer noted that, in general, significant planning matters did not justify the refusal of the application, and the development was considered to contribute positively to the area's economy and complied with the relevant policies.

- b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application - retain work in the area.

RESOLVED: To delegate powers to the Assistant Head of the Environment Department to approve the application, with conditions relating to the following:

- 1. Development to commence within 12 months of permission date.**
- 2. Operations shall cease by 31/12/2028. Restoration of the site by 30/06/2029 (to correspond with minerals permission ref. C24/1126/34/AC).**
- 3. In accordance with the approved plans.**
- 4. Mark the boundaries of the permission area and build a surface water collection point, including a bund to keep them on the site before commencing the development.**
- 5. Restriction on Permitted Development Rights, buildings, erection of structures, private roads, floodlighting and fences.**
- 6. Nothing other than inert waste excavation material shall be imported to the site (Waste Codes noted in the Waste Planning Assessment). An inspection of the material should be available upon request.**
- 7. No more than 50,000 tonnes of inert waste material is permitted to be carried to the site per year. No more than 20,000 tonnes will be stored on the site at any time.**
- 8. Unless otherwise agreed in writing, the details of the location and specifications of any floodlights will be submitted for the approval of the Waste Planning Authority before the installation work.**
- 9. Working Hours (corresponding with the existing).**
- 10. Noise restrictions (corresponding with the existing).**
- 11. Noise Control Plan to be submitted within 3 months of obtaining permission.**
- 12. All vehicles, equipment and plant operated on the site will be maintained in such a way so as to restrict the maximum levels of noise emissions to those noted in the manufacturers' specification. Equipment, plant and machinery will not be operated on the site without appropriate sound deadening screens, casework, enclosures and silencers.**

13. No operations on the site shall be undertaken in such a manner as to cause the raising of fugitive dust, and a water spray or other dust suppression system shall be maintained on site at all times together with an adequate supply of water. Stockpiles of materials and areas traversed by wheeled vehicles or within which the handling or movement of material is undertaken shall be watered or otherwise treated at such times and intervals as may be necessary to prevent the raising of such dust.
14. The surface of the site access to the public highway shall be kept free from mud and other debris and maintained at all times in a condition acceptable to the Waste Planning Authority such as to ensure that mud is prevented from being deposited onto the public highway.
15. Sheetings of lorries leaving and arriving at the site with stones or material that are less than 500mm.
16. Restriction of vehicular access to existing access arrangements.
17. A copy of this determination and the approved plans showing the method and direction of working and restoration shall be displayed in the operator's site office at all times during the life of the site.
18. The best practicable means and/or white noise reversing alarms shall be fitted to mobile plant and vehicles used on site.
19. Oil, fuels and chemicals stored on impervious base with bunds.
20. The operator shall monitor the site for the presence of non-native invasive plant species for each phase of the development, focussing particularly on Japanese knotweed, and implement control measures as appropriate.
21. Restoration and Aftercare (to match existing).

5.7 APPLICATION NUMBER C21/0590/17/LL Fferm Grafog, Groeslon, Caernarfon, Gwynedd.

Application for the change of use of land for the creation of a holiday touring site for caravans, motor homes (25 units) and tents (10 units), demolition of existing amenity building and erection of a new amenity building and associated developments; widening and improving the access to the A487 Trunk Road, including the installation of formal warning signs, which will facilitate the safe and efficient flow of traffic between the site and the A487.

Attention was drawn to the Late Observations Form.

- a) The Planning Officer highlighted that the site was a countryside site with the entrance located directly from the A487 Trunk Road. Currently, it was explained that the existing single-track entrance served the farm and the existing certified site, which allowed for five caravans and ten tents throughout the year; the site was located in a Wildlife Site and within a Surface Water Flood zone and Small Watercourses 2 and 3.

As the proposal involved a development for a touring caravan site, it was explained that it must be considered under policy TWR 5 of the LDP, which sets out a series of criteria for approving such developments.

The proposed development would be located on a level field surrounded by mature trees along its boundaries and therefore hidden from public locations; included retaining the existing hedge within the site and reinforcing the screening by proposing the planting of a new native hedge around the site to separate the caravan pitch from the wider field. It was noted that the existing facilities building, which included toilets and showers, would be demolished and

replaced with a higher quality mobile modular facilities building. It was added that the proposal was designed to meet licensing requirements in terms of space and facilities and therefore it was accepted that the development was standard and therefore compliant with Policy TWR 5 as it met the relevant criteria.

It was reported that the development was of high-quality in terms of design, layout and appearance, located in a non-invasive site which was effectively screened by the existing landscape features. It did not lead to an excess of hard surfaces, and the site was in an accessible location from the point of view of the main road network, where suitable access could be provided without significantly impairing the landscape's character. In addition, planning conditions could ensure that the site was used for holiday purposes only, for touring caravan use only, and that any units were removed from the site during periods when they are not in use.

It was added that the site relied on direct access off the A487 Trunk Road and as part of the application, improvements to the junction were proposed to enable two vehicles to pass safely when joining or exiting the trunk road, together with the installation of appropriate warning signs. The Welsh Government's Trunk Road Unit had originally noted an objection due to a lack of information and concerns about the safety of the access, in particular that the junction was narrowing to approximately 3-4m within 7m of the trunk road. However, during the application period, additional information and plans, including a Transport Technical Note, were submitted to respond to those concerns. As a result, there was no further objection from the Unit, provided that any consent was subject to certain conditions as set out in their response. On this basis, together with the proposed improvements and the possibility of imposing planning conditions to ensure road safety, the proposal was considered acceptable in terms of policies TRA 2 and TRA 4 of the LDP.

In the context of biodiversity matters, it was noted that the location of the proposed caravan site was within the Llain Ffynnon Wildlife Site, and approximately 25m from the Glynllifon Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which has been designated due to its population of bats. As the Competent Authority under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, the Council, before deciding to give consent for a project which is likely to have a significant impact on the SAC, either alone or in combination with other plans or projects, must consider any likely significant impacts on Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas. It was noted that this proposal sought to mitigate the impact on bats by planting a hedge to create a barrier to light spills, as well as creating a feeding habitat and providing a species-rich grassland.

It was added that Natural Resources Wales were now satisfied that the lighting could be controlled by a planning condition to ensure that it would not affect bat flight paths. In accordance with the information submitted, together with conditions to ensure their completion, it was not considered that the proposal would have an additional or adverse effect on the Glynllifon Lesser Horseshoe Bat population and would result in a neutral position for the Glynllifon Special Area of Conservation.

As a result of the development, an area of grassland currently used for horse grazing would be lost. While mitigation measures had been proposed, further comments were received from the Biodiversity Officer stating that additional improvements were needed to mitigate the

impact of the development, and further conditions were proposed. Subject to those conditions, there was no objection to the application. Subject to imposing appropriate conditions, it was considered that the development complied with Policies PS19, AMG 5 and AMG 6 of the LDP, together with the 2017 Regulations and Chapter 6 of Planning Policy Wales, by protecting designated sites and ensuring biodiversity improvements.

It was reported that visual, general and residential amenities, drainage and flooding, linguistic and sustainability matters were considered acceptable. The officers recommended to approve the application with conditions.

- b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant made the following observations:
 - Thanked the planning officer for the work undertaken in assessing the application.
 - She and her family had a strong connection with the community and the local area.
 - When they started the camping business in Grafog, the intention was to develop a high-quality site for visitors to stay and enjoy the area - they had worked hard to develop it.
 - Strongly hoped that the plan would continue to boost the local economy.
 - Asked committee to approve the application.
- c) The Chair highlighted that the Local Member had apologised for not being able to attend the meeting, and that she had no comments on the application.
- ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.
- d) During the ensuing discussion, the following observations were made by a Member:
 - Holiday season from 1/3 – 31/10 – was there a need to revise the timetable to boost the local economy?

In response to a question as to the point of imposing a condition on the storage of touring caravans if enforcement officers were not available to check the action, it was noted that it was an enforcement matter, but if Members were aware of specific sites that were in breach of these rules, a request could be made for that site to be inspected. It was added that planning permission must be obtained for the storage of caravans, and that the storage of caravans was not part of this application. The applicant had no objection to the conditions proposed – they were standard conditions for touring caravan sites.

RESOLVED: To approve with conditions

1. Time
2. In accordance with the amended plans.
3. Limit the number of touring units to 25 caravans and 10 tents only.
4. Holiday use only and keep a register.
5. Touring unit's holiday season - 1 March to 31 October.
6. No storing of touring caravans on the site.
7. Trunk Road conditions
8. Natural Resources lighting condition
9. Biodiversity conditions
10. Construction work hours
11. Welsh name
12. Welsh language signs
13. Hard-standing condition

14. Footpaths condition

Notes:

NRW letter note

SUDS note

Licensing note

The meeting commenced at 13:00 and concluded at 15:20.

CHAIR