

## Potential site analysis for site 427, Land adjoining Walton Hill, Little Haven

Associated settlement	<b>Little Haven</b>
LDP settlement tier	<b>Rural centres</b>
Community Council area	<b>The Havens</b>
Site area (hectares)	<b>0.82</b>

**Site register reference(s) (if proposed as development site for LDP)** No LDP site registration

### Relationship to designated areas

Within 500 metres of a SAC.

Not within 500 metres of a SPA.

Not within 500 metres of a National Nature Reserve.

Not within 100 metres of a Local Nature Reserve.

Not within 500 metres of a Marine Nature Reserve.

Not within 100 metres of a Woodland Trust Nature Reserve.

Not within 100 metres of a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve.

Not within 100 metres of Access Land.

Not within 100 metres of a Scheduled Ancient Monument.

Within 50 metres of a Listed Building.

Not within 500 metres of a Historic Landscape Area.

Not within 100 metres of a Historic Garden.

Not within 50 metres of Contaminated Land.

Not within airfield safeguarding zones for buildings under 15m high.

Not within HSE safeguarding zones.

Not within MoD safeguarding zones for buildings under 15m high.

Not within 10 metres of a Tree Protection Order.

Not within 100 metres of ancient or semi-natural woodland.

Underlying Agricultural Land Classification: 3 (1 is Agriculturally most valuable, 5 is least valuable).

Not within a quarry buffer zone.

Not within safeguarded route for roads or cycleways.

No Public Right of Way.

Not a Village Green.

## Stage one commentary

Site is not wholly within a Site of Special Scientific Interest; Natura 2000 site; National, Local, Marine, Woodland Trust or Wildlife Trust nature reserve; or Scheduled Ancient Monument.

Does the site pass stage one site criteria tests? **Yes**

## Stage two evaluation

<b>Ownership</b>	Mr Llewelin		
<b>General overview</b>	The site occupies sloping land towards the top of the steep slopes in this part of Little Haven. The land has been terraced and is grassed. The northern and higher part of the site is occupied by a garage/workshop. It is bisected by the settlement boundary for the JUDP.		
<b>Greenfield or Brownfield/PDL</b>	Greenfield	<b>Estimated number of dwellings</b>	0
<b>Adjoining uses and access</b>	There is low density housing to the west. To the south is a narrow land and further low density development. To the north and east is undeveloped countryside. Access to this site is from a narrow lane leading out of the village.		
<b>Visible constraints to development</b>	The site is close to the skyline and would cause considerable visual intrusion as well as extending the developed area of the village into the countryside.		
<b>Impact on National Park's Special Qualities</b>	The sweep of land around the east of St Brides Bay is characterised by its strong visual relationship to the coast and generally a high degree of exposure. Within this area Little Haven is a small, compact village predominantly contained within a steep valley with a strong coastal character derived from its situation on the coast and the feel of a small, traditional fishing village. This site is situated on high land overlooking the village and would be visually intrusive resulting in an adverse impact on the special qualities of the National Park.		
<b>Landscape impact mitigation measures</b>			
<b>Affordable housing capacity assessment</b>			
<b>General notes</b>	The site was the subject of an objection to the JUDP. In recommending an amendment to the Plan to incorporate reasonable curtilage, the Inspector advised: The Authorities' resistance to any such change is essentially based on their fear that by including the additional land proposed by the Objectors further housing would be impossible to resist. While I can understand that concern, I have previously made it clear in my conclusions on the RDL/settlement boundary issue under the Policy 42 heading that the inclusion of land within the defined boundary would not inevitably lead to its development; there are policies in this Plan whose provisions would enable proposals for new housing development to be rejected where, for example, environmental/amenity/landscape considerations justified such an approach. Those considerations are apposite here, especially given how sensitively located the		

objection land is on this relatively exposed hillside within the National Park.

### Development planning history

Subject to objection 862D1 during UDP process

### Planning application history (planning applications within, overlapping or adjacent to the potential site)

Application code	Application type	Proposal	Decision	Decision date
98/356	FULL	Dwelling	REF	26-Nov-1998
99/095	FULL	Dwelling	REF	28-Apr-1999
00/186	FULL	Removal of planning condition 7 from NP/422/94	REF	26-Jun-2000
00/211	FULL	Change of use to restaurant (open to non-residents and associated car parking) Retrospective	REF	26-Sep-2000
00/566	FULL	Sub-division into 2 dwellings	REF	16-Feb-2001
02/158	FULL	Extension & conservatory	APP	17-May-2002
02/187	FULL	Dwelling	REF	17-May-2002
02/477	FULL	Dwelling	REF	05-Dec-2002
02/563	FULL	Removal of occupancy condition	REF	08-Jan-2003
03/369	FULL	Refurbishment & extension	APP	11-Sep-2003
03/400	FULL	Garden steps	REF	20-Nov-2003
04/330	FULL	Workshop alterations & extension to curtilage	APP	18-Sep-2006
05/277	FULL	Re-roof conservatory	WD	17-Oct-2005

### Summary of geological risk (class A is lowest risk, class E is highest risk)

Running sand class A; compressible ground class A; landslide class B; no soluble rocks; shrink swell class B

### Summary of flood risk (from TAN 15)

Not within a TAN 15 zone

**Public transport service** Services on one to four days a week.

### Distance from potential sites to selected services in kilometres

Nearest shop	0.67	Nearest doctor	1.1
Nearest pub	0.15	Nearest Dentist	8.24
Nearest primary school	0.59	Nearest secondary school	7.96
Nearest post office	0.22	Nearest petrol station	7.68
Nearest community hall	7.39	Nearest police station	8.63
Nearest letter box	0.21	Nearest library	8.14
Nearest place of worship	0.56	Nearest cash point	0.66
Nearest sports ground	0.85		

\* Distances are in kilometres, 'as the crow flies'

### Consultee responses

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Date of response</b>	<b>Response</b>
Countryside Council for Wales		Not consulted
Environment Agency Wales		Not consulted
PCC Highways		Not consulted
Dwr Cymru		Not consulted

### Reasons site is suitable for development

**Reasons site is not suitable for development**      The site is close to the skyline and would cause considerable visual intrusion as well as extending the developed area of the village into the countryside.

**Does the site pass stage two tests?**      No      **Proposed use**