

**ADDENDUM REPORT BY HEAD OF PLANNING, AND PUBLIC PROTECTION SERVICES**  
**LATE INFORMATION & AMENDMENTS TO COMMITTEE REPORTS**

**PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

The following sheets provide a summary of information received since the preparation of the committee report and matters of relevance to the report, which will be referred to at the relevant item.

This addendum report also indicates changes in the agenda order to reflect public speaking. Those Part 1 applications involving public speaking will be dealt with towards the start of the meeting.

**AGENDA ORDER**

**PART 1**

<b>ITEM No</b>			<b>PAGE</b>
	<b>Public Speaker items first</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>07/2013/0026/PF</b>	TY NANT, LLANDRILLO, CORWEN	<b>43</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>11/2013/0032/PF</b>	LAND ADJ. TO CLOCAENOG FOREST, WEST OF TAN Y CREIGIAU, CLAWDDNEWYDD, RUTHIN	<b>53</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>16/2013/0189/PF</b>	LLANBEDR HALL, LLANBEDR DYFFRYN CLWYD, RUTHIN	<b>71</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>18/2012/1595/PF</b>	HIGHFIELD PARK, LLANGWYFAN, DENBIGH	<b>81</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>18/2013/0023/PF</b>	BRYN EGWALLT, LLANDYRNOG, DENBIGH	<b>97</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>25/2013/0191/PFT</b>	WERN UCHAF, NANTGLYN, DENBIGH	<b>117</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>41/2012/1390/PF</b>	BRYN FFYNNON, BODFARI, DENBIGH	<b>135</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>45/2013/0024/PF</b>	MARINE LAKE, WELLINGTON ROAD, RHYL	<b>189</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>47/2013/0137/PFT</b>	MARIAN MAWR, CWM, RHYL	<b>211</b>

**THEN**

<b>1</b>	<b>03/2013/0122/PF</b>	SPRINGBANK, BIRCH HILL, LLANGOLLEN	<b>35</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>24/2013/0006/PF</b>	THE CARTSHED, RHYD Y CILGWYN FARM, LADY BAGOTS DRIVE, RHEWL, RUTHIN	<b>107</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>42/2012/1638/PO</b>	LAND AT (PART GARDEN OF) MOUNT HOUSE, DYSERTH, RHYL	<b>149</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>43/2012/1561/PF</b>	113 FFORDD TALARGOCH, MELIDEN, PRESTATYN	<b>157</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>43/2013/0123/PF</b>	2 BASTION ROAD, PRESTATYN	<b>171</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>43/2013/0181/PF</b>	19 KINGS AVENUE, PRESTATYN	<b>181</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>45/2013/0299/PF</b>	FRONFRAITH, BOUGHTON AVENUE, RHYL	<b>203</b>

**Public Speaker: *Against* :** Mr Lawrence Jones

**Late Representations**

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH OFFICER – Pollution and Public Health Object.

Limited details of sanitary facilities/septic tank.

Inadequate trees and bushes to screen the site.

Already sufficient caravanning and tenting accommodation in the area.

Access to the site is inadequate.

Area for caravans and tents should be away from neighbouring properties to reduce impacts.

Officer Note

Section 1.1 and 1.2 of the Officer report inadvertently mixes up the location of the fields proposed for the caravans and the campsite :

Paras 1.1.1.1 and 1.2.2 should be corrected to refer the 10 pitch campsite, not the caravan site.

Paras 1.1.1.2 and 1.2.3 should be corrected to refer to 10 plot caravan site, not the camp site.

Para 4.2.5 should be corrected to refer to Moel is y Goedwig being 85 metres from the camping site, and 120 metres from the caravan site.

Section 3.1 of the report should refer to :

Policy ENV 11 – Safeguarding of High Quality Agricultural Land

For clarity

The map on the YELLOW SHEET illustrates the respective locations of the main uses proposed, with the line of the public footpath, AOB boundary and the site of a February 2004 refusal of permission for a 10 holiday lodge development immediately to the south of the proposed campsite, a decision which was subsequently upheld on appeal in July 2004.

For the record, the applicant is employed in the Housing Services Section of the County Council.

**Addendum report**

The application was subject to a Site inspection panel meeting at 8.30am on Friday 12/ 04 / 2013

In attendance were:

CHAIR – Councillor Dewi Owens

VICE CHAIR – Councillor Meirick Ll. Davies

LOCAL MEMBER – Councillor Cefyn Williams

COMMUNITY COUNCIL – Councillor Geraint Jones

The Officer present was Mr Ian Weaver

The reason for calling the site panel was to allow assessment of the potential visual / landscape, and residential amenity issues.

At the Site Inspection panel meeting, Members considered the following matters:

1. The detailing of the proposed development
2. The potential visual / landscape impact
3. The potential impact on the residential amenities of occupiers of adjacent property

<p>4. Points raised in objection to the application</p> <p>In relation to the matters outlined :</p> <p>1. The Planning Officer outlined the basis of the proposals, which were indicated by the applicant as a diversification to supplement farm income. Members viewed the submitted plans and noted the proposals involved use of separate areas of land for camping, touring caravans, and the storage of caravans, as well as the installation of a septic tank and the retention of a new vehicular access onto the B4401. The Planning Officer confirmed that the late sheets for Committee would correct reference in the Officer report to the respective locations of the caravan and camping sites. Members were aware that part of the site was indicated as Grade 3 quality on the Agricultural Land Quality maps.</p> <p>2. Members observed the site was in open countryside, and on rising ground on the east side of the Upper Dee valley. It was noted that the site was within the Area of Outstanding Beauty in the Unitary Development Plan, the boundary of which was the B road to the west of the site.</p> <p>3. Members walked around the proposed tenting site, noting the relationship of Ty Nant with nearby property, in particular Moel is y Goedwig to the south west, Ty Uchaf to the north east, and a public footpath running south west-north east across that part of the site.</p> <p>4. Members were advised of the basis of representations received on the application, which included concerns over the visual and landscape impact, the effect on residential amenity, ecology, farming activity, and questions over the need for more caravan sites in the area. The Community Council representative confirmed they had not raised objections, and that it was hoped if permission were to be granted that the site would be run properly.</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 3</b> <b><u>11/2013/0032/PFT</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>LAND ADJ TO CLOCAENOG FOREST, WEST OF TAN Y CREIGIAU, CLAWDDNEWYDD, RUTHIN</u></b></p>	<p>53</p>
<p><b>Public Speaker: <i>For</i> :</b> Charlotte Wilcox.</p> <p><b>Late representations</b> Representations in objection received from : H Jones, Maes Draw, Clawddnewydd</p> <p>Main points : <u>Need for turbine Farm is over 10 miles away / only for financial benefit</u> <u>Visual, noise, shadow flicker impact</u></p>		
<p><b>ITEM 4</b> <b><u>16/2013/0189/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>LLANBEDR HALL, LLANBEDR DYFFRYN CLWYD</u></b></p>	<p>71</p>
<p><b>Public Speaker: <i>Against</i> :</b> Kerry James <b>Public Speaker: <i>For</i> :</b> Stuart Hatherall</p> <p><b>Late representation</b> From Gamlins Solicitors on behalf of Mr McQueen Cedar Gardens, Llanbedr Hall.</p> <p>The letter relates to a right of access issue. This is a legal matter between the applicant and Mr McQueen and does not, in Officers opinion, have a bearing on the acceptability of the proposed scheme. The contents of the letter can be included as a note to applicant should members resolve to grant the application.</p> <p><b>Addendum report</b></p>		

The application was subject to a Site inspection panel meeting at 10am on Friday  
12/ 04 / 2013

In attendance were:

CHAIR – Councillor Dewi Owens

VICE CHAIR – Councillor Meirick Ll. Davies

LOCAL MEMBER – Councillor Huw. O. Williams

COMMUNITY COUNCIL – Councillors Sian Jones and Richard Thomas

The Officer present was Mr Ian Weaver

The reason for calling the site panel was to allow assessment of the detailing of the proposals given the relationship with adjacent properties.

At the Site Inspection panel meeting, Members considered the following matters:

1. The detailing of the proposed development
2. The potential impact on access /parking arrangements in the locality
3. The potential impact on the residential amenities of occupiers of adjacent property and the AONB.
4. Points raised in objection to the application

In relation to the matters outlined :

1. Members viewed the submitted plans and noted the proposals involved the conversion and extension of an existing garage building into a 3 bedroom unit, with associated parking spaces adjacent to the extension. Members also viewed the plans of a previously approved scheme of conversion on the garage, granted permission in September 2011. They spent some time clarifying the physical extent of the proposed extension (in terms of its footprint and height), the location of the proposed parking bays and the turning area shown on the submitted plans, the location of the proposed amenity area, and the detailing relative to adjacent properties.

2. Members observed the site was within an existing complex of buildings close to Llanbedr Hall, with a long established access serving a number of dwellings / flats. They walked around the area surrounding the garage and other properties to appreciate the potential impact of the proposals on vehicle circulation and parking arrangements. Questions were raised by Members and the Community Council over the adequacy of the number of parking spaces, how the proposed turning area was to be created, the means of delineating the parking bays, whether the location of the parking bays and the enclosure of the amenity area would lead to difficulties for the passage of other vehicles (including any larger emergency / service vehicles and others seeking access to private garages to the south).

3. Members noted the respective position of the building and others in close proximity, to assess the relationships between units and the likely impact on the amenities of residents. They assessed the detailing of the proposed conversion including the position of windows, the balcony for the first floor bedroom, the raised section of roof on the extension, and the amenity area proposed for occupiers. They were aware of the site being located in the AONB.

4. Members were advised of the basis of representations received on the application, which included local concerns over the increased height of the building and its visual impact, issues of privacy and access rights.

#### Officer Notes

Following matters raised in the course of the Site Inspection Panel meeting:

The current guidance on parking standards in SPG21 – Parking Requirements in New Developments refers to a maximum of 3 spaces for 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings. The Highway Officer has advised that his recommendation would be that two designated

	<p>parking spaces would be adequate in connection with the development proposed.</p> <p>Officers suggest the inclusion of the following additional condition and note to applicant if Committee resolve to grant planning permission:-</p> <p>8. Notwithstanding the submitted plans, no development shall be permitted to commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The detailing of the openings / features on the rear elevation of the building;</li> <li>b) An alternative location for the 2 parking spaces (which shall not be as shown on the site plan) and the means of delineating those spaces.</li> <li>c) The detailing of the means of enclosure of the proposed amenity area, and any pedestrian access thereto;</li> <li>d) The detailing of the proposed turning area as shown on the site plan, including how this area is to be created having regard to the difference in site levels relative to the main forecourt;</li> <li>e) The external wall materials to be used on the building (colour, type and texture of render);</li> <li>f) The detailing of the boundary wall(s) of the proposed courtyard area.</li> <li>g) The detailing of the area immediately outside the ground floor dining room (steps/Juliette balcony, etc)</li> </ul> <p><i>Reason for Condition</i></p> <p>For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure the development does not adversely impact on vehicle circulation, and in the interests of visual amenity.</p> <p><b>Note to applicant</b></p> <p>You are asked to discuss the details required by Condition 8 of this permission with the Highway and Planning Officers prior to the formal submission of an application.</p>	
<p><b>ITEM 5</b> <b><u>18/2012/1595/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>HIGHFIELD PARK, LLANGWYFAN, DENBIGH</u></b></p>	<p>81</p>
	<p><b>Officer request for DEFERRAL</b></p> <p>The request is made as the applicants agents have confirmed on the 15<sup>th</sup> April 2013 that the proposals do not now include for <u>any</u> additional visitor parking on land to the south of the main Admin block (Alexander House).</p> <p>Officers respectfully suggest that as these are material changes to the scheme which has been the subject of formal consultation and scrutiny at the Site Inspection Panel, that it is necessary to undertake a fresh consultation exercise, allowing bodies such as the Community Council, Highways Officer and neighbours opportunity to either confirm or revise their comments.</p>	
<p><b>ITEM 6</b> <b><u>18/2013/0023/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>BRYN EGWALLT, LLANDYRNOG, DENBIGH</u></b></p>	<p>97</p>
	<p><b>Public Speaker: For :</b> Ruth Thomas</p> <p><b>Late representations</b></p> <p>LLANDYRNOG COMMUNITY COUNCIL</p> <p>“Llandyrnog Community Council are now in a position to support this scheme providing there are strict conditions relating to it’s use – that it’s use is incidental to the use of the main house and not for any commercial or business use in any shape or form.</p> <p>The main concern was, and still is, the size of the annexe. It’s the size of a bungalow and we are somewhat surprised that DCC do not have any policy controlling the size of an annexe as such. Is this something that needs looking at?”</p>	

<p><b>Revised wording of condition</b>  2. The use of the annexe shall be restricted at all times to that incidental to the enjoyment of the dwelling Bryn Egwaltt, and it shall not be permitted to operate as a trade or business separate from the dwelling.</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 8</b>  <u>25/2013/0191/PF</u></p>	<p><b><u>WERN UCHAF, NANTGLYN, DENBIGH</u></b></p>	<p>117</p>
<p><b>Public Speaker: <i>Against</i> :</b> Judy Young  <b>Public Speaker: <i>For</i> :</b> Elgan Roberts</p> <p><b>Late representations</b></p> <p><u>AIRBUS</u>  Confirm the application does not conflict with aerodrome safeguarding criteria, and therefore have no objections.</p> <p><b>Additional information from applicant's agent</b>  This consists of a 6 page response to objections made by local residents and the Community Council, received late Tuesday afternoon. It argues on <u>visual impact objections</u> that the new location is less obtrusive than the original approved location, that cumulative impacts are low, as accepted by the applicant's and Council's landscape consultants, and that the topography and natural screening should mitigate any adverse visual impacts. In relation to the <u>community safety</u>, the statement indicates that no significant shadow flicker is expected within public areas, and that noise issues have been appropriately assessed and the potential noise generated should be well below the relevant levels. Comparison with Gorsedd Bran is considered inconclusive given that proposal was for multiple turbines with heights 3 times that proposed at Wern Uchaf. In relation to <u>policy</u>, it is contended that all relevant policies have been adhered to, this is a micro scale project acceptable under Welsh Government policy, and informal commercial use is unfounded.</p> <p><u>Representations in support received from:</u>  S Luhde-Thompson, Ty Llarwydden, Nantglyn</p> <p>Main points:  <u>Need</u> – Need more small scale wind generated power owned locally</p> <p><u>Representations in objection received from:</u>  J Yorke, Pen y Bryn Farm, Waen, Nantglyn</p> <p>Main points  <u>Gorsedd Bran Windfarm appeal decision</u> Clear conclusions of Inspector on adverse effect on local community should be respected (in particular Nantglyn).</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 9</b>  <u>41/2012/1390/PF</u></p>	<p><b><u>BRYN FFYNNON, BODFARI</u></b></p>	<p>135</p>
<p><b>Public Speaker: <i>For</i> :</b> Mr Peter Lloyd</p> <p><b>Late representations</b></p> <p><u>BODFARI COMMUNITY COUNCIL (on amended plans)</u>  "Recommends refusal on the following grounds:-  Contrary to the requirements of UDP policy HSG 8(iv) the proposed replacement dwelling is substantially different from the existing dwelling in terms of its siting, scale, form, design and materials which do not reflect the character, appearance and traditional building styles of the locality.</p> <p>Whilst it is correct that no single building style predominates within the area, the traditional Welsh long cottage is the major style in over 50% of the buildings in this locale and the loss of an example of this style together with the factors listed above, particularly in an AONB, should be resisted as contrary to HSG 8(v).</p>		

<p>Contrary to HSG 8(vi), no exceptional circumstances have been advanced by the applicant to justify an alternative siting of the proposed dwelling, and, in the absence of such exceptional circumstances, the requirements of policy ENV 2 would be better met by siting the proposed dwelling on the footprint of the existing.”</p> <p>Members are referred to the plan on the GREEN sheet which shows the location of the public footpath to the north of the application site.</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 14</b> <b><u>45/2013/0024/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>MARINE LAKE, RHYL</u></b></p>	189
<p><b>Public Speaker: For:</b> Carol Evans</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 16</b> <b><u>47/2013/0137/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>MARIAN MAWR, CWM</u></b></p>	211
<p><b>Public Speaker: For:</b> Richard Corbett</p> <p><b>Late representations</b></p> <p><u>AIRBUS</u> Confirm the application does not conflict with aerodrome safeguarding criteria, and therefore have no objections.</p> <p><u>E-mail from applicant's agent</u> The e-mail provides information on the predicted output of the turbine (189,220 kWhr) with an annual useage at the farm of 130,000 kWhr, most of which is to be used by the Dairy unit. He has also included an electricity bill from the dairy unit which confirms this order of usage.</p> <p><u>Officer Note</u> It is agreed that the proposal would comply with the TAN6 requirements as being a farm diversification project. However this is only one material consideration and does not outweigh the negative impact the proposal would have on the AONB.</p>		

THEN RETURN TO ITEM 1

<p><b>ITEM 1</b> <b><u>03/2013/0122/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>SPRING BANK, BIRCH HILL, LLANGOLLEN</u></b></p>	35
<p>In the absence of any local objection to the application, and following consultation with the Local Member, it has been agreed that referral of the application to Committee is not necessary and a planning permission has therefore been issued.</p> <p>The application does not therefore need to be considered by the Committee.</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 7</b> <b><u>24/2013/0006/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>THE CARTSHED, RHYD Y CILGWYN FARM, LADY BAGOTS DRIVE, RHEWL, RUTHIN</u></b></p>	107
<p>No late representations received.</p>		

<p><b>ITEM 10</b> <b><u>42/2012/1638/PO</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>LAND AT (PART GARDEN OF) MOUNT HOUSE, DYSERTH</u></b></p>	<p>149</p>
<p><u>Correction to CONSULTATION response – Page 152</u> The Community Council is Dyserth (not St Asaph City Council)</p> <p><b>Addendum report</b></p> <p>The application was subject to a Site inspection panel meeting at 12.30pm on Friday 12/ 04 / 2013</p> <p>In attendance were: CHAIR – Councillor Dewi Owens VICE CHAIR – Councillor Meirick Ll. Davies LOCAL MEMBER – Councillor Peter Owen</p> <p>COMMUNITY COUNCIL – Councillor David G. Jones</p> <p>The Officer present was Mr Ian Weaver</p> <p>The reason for calling the site panel was to allow assessment of the nature of development in the vicinity of the site to address the planning policy issues relating to infill development.</p> <p>At the Site Inspection panel meeting, Members considered the following matters:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The detailing of the proposed development</li> <li>2. The planning policy relating to ‘infill development’ in open countryside.</li> <li>3. The potential impact on visual amenity, the landscape of the AONB and the residential amenities of occupiers of adjacent property</li> <li>4. Points raised in objection to the application.</li> </ol> <p>In relation to the matters outlined :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Members viewed the submitted plans and noted the application was for outline permission for the erection of a single dwelling, seeking specific approval of the means of access to the plot. They viewed the site from the south west side of Mount House and were advised of the proposed position of the driveway and the dwelling relative to existing residential properties in the locality. They also walked along the adjacent highway to observe the location of other dwellings in the vicinity.</li> <li>2. Members were aware that the site was in open countryside outside any identified settlement in the Unitary Plan. There was a detailed discussion on the wording of the Unitary Plan policy relating to ‘infill development’ (HSG 5) and the advice on this topic in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 10. Members had particular regard to the definitions of ‘groups of houses’, and to the policy wording which related to ‘the infilling of a small gap between buildings within a continually developed frontage’, and how these may apply to the circumstances at the site. The Local Member drew particular attention to the number of dwellings in the area around the site as this was considered an important consideration in the assessment of the application.</li> <li>3. Members were aware of the plot being located within the AONB and its proximity to Graig Fawr. Members noted the respective location of adjoining residential properties, the potential relationship and impact thereon. They also noted the proposed route of the proposed access to the plot, this being via the existing entrance to Mount House.</li> <li>4. Members were advised of the basis of representations received on the application, which included concerns over the visual and landscape impact, privacy and amenity, and conflicts with planning policies. The Community Council representative explained that they had raised no objection to the application.</li> </ol>		



<p><u>Officer note</u> Whilst acknowledging the need to determine the application against the policies of the Unitary Plan, Members at the Site Panel requested that a note be included on the late sheets to clarify whether the development strategy in the Local Development Plan may have any implications for such sites in loose collections of dwellings outside recognised settlements.</p> <p>The Development Plan section have advised that the group of dwellings around Mount House and at Bryniau have not been identified during the Local Development Plan process as a potential hamlet for development purposes.</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 11</b> <b><u>43/2012/1561/</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>113 FFORDD TALARGOCH, MELIDEN, PRESTATYN</u></b></p>	157
<p><b>Late representations</b></p> <p>PRESTATYN TOWN COUNCIL "No objection" (Comments on amended plans)</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 12</b> <b><u>43/2013/0123/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>2 BASTION ROAD, PRESTATYN</u></b></p>	143
<p><b>Late representations</b> Representations in objection received from: Mr N Croese, 8 Marne Road, Prestatyn</p> <p>Main points :</p> <p><u>Need</u> - no need for another business of this type in the area <u>Highways / parking</u> - will add to local parking problems <u>Residential amenity</u> - additional disruption in residential area</p> <p>Councillor James Davies has emailed to advise he will not be present at Committee but has asked that the following points be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This property and the one forming the subject of Item 13 are not on the High Street itself and are therefore reasonable locations for non-retail uses.</li> <li>• Previous concerns at over concentration of takeaways on the High Street leading to loss of vitality does not really apply in these locations.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>ITEM 13</b> <b><u>43/2013/0181/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>19 KINGS AVENUE, PRESTATYN</u></b></p>	181
<p>See comments from Councillor James Davies, noted under item 12 above.</p>		
<p><b>ITEM 15</b> <b><u>45/2013/0299/PF</u></b></p>	<p><b><u>FRONFRAITH, BOUGHTON AVENUE, RHYL</u></b></p>	203
<p><b>Officers notes</b> The Project Officer in the Development Services section has indicated that local residents have sought legal advice over the right of way issue, and states that the Council have a 'legal right as far as land ownership is concerned to access the highway'.</p>		