

REPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT TEAM LEADER ON APPEALS

The following appeals have been lodged with the Authority and the current position of each is as follows:-

NP/19/0522/FUL Outline planning permission for 14 affordable housing units. Full planning permission for the change of use of land from 85 tents & tourers to 85 static caravans with associated landscaping, distributor roads and new sewage pumping station – Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier

Type Written Representations

Current Position The initial paperwork has been sent to the Inspectorate.

NP/20/0129/FUL Proposed erection of first floor extension above existing utility space to side of dwelling & modest single storey rear extension & all associated works. Also, formation of new/reconfigured stepped pedestrian access up to the dwelling to front – 133 Castle Way, Dale

Type Written Representations

Current Position The appeal has been dismissed and a copy of the Inspectors decision is attached.

NP/20/0150/FUL Reserved matters application following NP/18/0342/OUT for a single dwelling – Penfeidr Uchaf, Newport

Type Written Representations

Current Position The appeal has been dismissed and a copy of the Inspectors decision is attached

NP/20/0379/FUL Proposed balcony to rear, new roof to conservatory, with window and door alterations – 23 Scandinavia Heights, Saundersfoot

Type Written Representations

Current Position The appeal has been allowed and a copy of the Inspectors decision is attached



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 23/02/21

gan **Melissa Hall, BA(Hons), BTP, MSc, MRTPI**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 15/3/21

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23/02/21

by **Melissa Hall, BA(Hons), BTP, MSc, MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 15th March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/D/21/3268177

Site address: 133 Castle Way, Dale, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3RN

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Dale Evans against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
 - The application Ref: NP/20/0129/FUL dated 3 March 2020, was refused by notice dated 10 November 2020.
 - The development proposed is described as proposed erection of first floor extension above existing utility space to side of dwelling and modest single storey rear extension and all associated works. Also, formation of new/reconfigured stepped pedestrian access up to the dwelling to front.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to the proposed erection of first floor extension above existing utility space to side of dwelling.
 2. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to the remainder of the application, and planning permission is granted for the single storey rear extension and all associated works and the formation of new/reconfigured stepped pedestrian access up to the dwelling to front in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: NP/20/0129/FUL dated 3 March 2020 and the plans submitted with it (so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted) subject to the following conditions:
 - (i) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
 - (ii) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing No's 1693-05 dated September 19 and 1693-06A dated January 20.

Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved plans and drawings submitted with the application.
-

(iii) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to comply with LDP Policy 29.

Procedural Matters

3. The proposal comprises a first-floor side extension, a single storey rear extension and the reconfiguration of the stepped pedestrian access to the front. The Authority has not taken issue with the rear extension or the pedestrian access, and I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issue

4. This is the effect of the proposed first floor side extension on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is one of a group of six dwellings which form a semi-circular arrangement centred on an area of open space. The group are situated on higher ground than the adjacent highway and are accessed via pedestrian pathways only. On-street parking is provided along Castle Way, fronting the area of open space.
6. I note the Authority states that the site is of historic interest and lies adjacent to the listed St James Church. However, it does not provide me with details of the special historic interest that the site possesses or the Listing description in relation to the Church.
7. I observed that the appeal site is separated from the Church and its grounds by heavily vegetated boundaries, the highway and the detached dwelling at no. 131. For the most part, the appeal property is not read in the context of the listed building given its siting, orientation and physical separation. Although distant views of the appeal site with the Church and its grounds in the foreground are gained from Blue Anchor Way to the south, specific design details such as that proposed would not be readily apparent at this distance. Hence, I cannot conclude that the proposed first floor extension would have any significant effect on this listed building or its setting, not least as it would be sited on the side elevation facing away from the Church and its grounds.
8. This part of the settlement is characterised predominantly by post-war dwellings of relatively simple form, design and external appearance. The Authority contends that the group were constructed to house officers of the military and are largely unaltered, retaining much of their original design and form. Furthermore, it states that the design of the extension 'fails to reflect the character of the crescent of houses' and would 'harm local distinctiveness', but its delegated report offers little further explanation of the harm it alleges.
9. I acknowledge that there is a common architectural language to the group. Nevertheless, I observed that there have been additions and alterations to the properties; this includes the appeal dwelling which has undergone considerable modernisation incorporating two first floor Juliet balconies with glass balustrade and large bi-fold patio doors at ground floor on the front elevation. The pair of semi-detached dwellings in the group have also been altered and includes the insertion of large glazed openings in the front elevation of the single storey link element. Windows, doors and finishes have been changed and several of the original single storey flat roof side extensions have been replaced with pitched roof alternatives.

Overall, these works have introduced contemporary elements into the street scene such that the group does not retain the degree of uniformity it may once have had. Rather, these additions and alterations now form part of the character of the surrounding area and the context for new development.

10. Notwithstanding the context that I have described, the dwellings largely retain their original form and mass above ground floor level, with the spacing and rhythm between the properties clearly read and understood. The addition of the proposed first floor side extension would fill much of the visual gap at upper floor level between the host dwelling and the neighbouring property, thus disrupting the spacing and pattern of the wider development to which I have referred. Moreover, although I accept that the extension would be set back from the main front elevation and set down from the ridge of the host dwelling, detailed design elements are proposed which do not reflect the more simple style of the group. For example, this modestly sized extension would include a front gable, a first-floor overhang and the addition of what would be a third Juliet balcony on the front elevation. Whilst such features may well replicate those already present on the host dwelling, the extension would not appear subservient as a result, instead reading as a fussy addition to the property. Taking all these elements together, the proposal would have an unsatisfactory relationship with the existing dwelling and would fail to reflect the more simple and modest character of the group and its spacing.
11. Consequently, I find that it would have a harmful effect on the host dwelling, its immediate surroundings, the rural centre of Dale and the special landscape character of the NP. It would therefore conflict with the adopted Pembrokeshire Coast Local Development Plan 2, Policies 6 and 8 which seek to ensure development is consistent with the identity and character of the rural centre, town or village in which it lies, Policy 14 which seeks to protect the special qualities of the NP and Policy 29 which requires new development proposals to be well designed in terms of place and local distinctiveness.

Other Matters

12. Although I note the Authority's concern that the side extension could be separated from the main dwelling and occupied independently, its use as a separate unit of accommodation would require planning permission in any event.

Conditions

13. In addition to the standard conditions detailed on the appeal form relating to the time limit for the commencement of development, compliance with the approved plans and the use of matching materials, the Authority suggests a further two conditions which relate to the provision of bird or bat boxes in an appropriate location (my emphasis) and a requirement for any additional external lighting to be low level, downward facing and on a PIR activated timer. The reasons given for both conditions is to maintain and enhance biodiversity and in order to meet obligations set out within the Environment (Wales) Act 2016.
14. I have had regard to the conditions in the context of the tests outlined in Welsh Government Circular 016/2014 '*The Use of Conditions for Development Management*'.
15. In my opinion, both conditions would fail to meet the tests outlined in the Circular. In respect of the requirement to provide bird or bat boxes, such a suggestion lacks precision and effectiveness insofar as no details of the boxes or their locations are required so it would be left to the installer to decide on a specification and what constitutes an 'appropriate' location. Additionally, it has not been demonstrated that

it is a reasonable requirement in the circumstances and, even if a requirement of multiple bat or bird boxes were to be justified, no time limit has been set for their installation. It thus fails the tests insofar as such a condition would be imprecise and neither reasonable nor enforceable.

16. Turning to the second suggested condition regarding external lighting. Such a condition would seek to introduce control over the existing dwelling, which is not fairly related to the development proposed. It thus also fails the conditions tests outlined in the Circular.

Conclusion

17. The element of the scheme with which I take issue is severable from the remainder of the proposal. Therefore, for the reasons I have given, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed in relation to the first-floor side extension. However, the appeal should succeed in relation to the single storey rear extension and associated works and the formation of new/reconfigured stepped pedestrian access up to the dwelling.
18. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards the Welsh Ministers' well-being objective of building healthier communities and better environments.

Melissa Hall

INSPECTOR



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 24/02/21

gan **J P Tudor, BA (Hons), Cyfreithiwr (ddim yn ymarfer)**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 31/3/21

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24/02/21

by **J P Tudor, BA (Hons), Solicitor (non-practising)**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 31st March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/A/20/3264632

Site address: Land East of Penfeidr Uchaf, Ffordd Cilgwyn, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0QF

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant consent, agreement or approval to details required by a condition of a planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mrs Andrea Callaghan against the decision of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
- The application Ref: NP/20/0150/FUL dated 14 February 2020, sought approval of details pursuant to condition No. 1 of a planning permission Ref: NP/18/0342/OUT granted on 4 October 2018.
- The application was refused by notice dated 21 October 2020.
- The development proposed is residential development of a single dwelling.
- The details for which approval is sought are: access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park (PCNP).

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a small grassed field which slopes down towards a country road. It is bounded by hedgerow and located within a cluster of detached dwellings on generous plots in a rural upland area of the PCNP. Some of the houses and extensions have significant levels of glazing facing towards Newport Bay and the Nevern Estuary. The houses in the area vary in age and style but the appeal site is flanked by a row of traditional two-storey stone dwellings, of similar design to each other, and a single-storey stone cottage, at Penfeidr Ucaf, which face towards the road. Those traditionally designed buildings provide the immediate context to the appeal site and contribute positively to the attractive character and appearance of the area.

4. The single-storey cottage at Penfeidr Uchaf has a contemporary side extension but while the extension has two large windows facing the road, it reads more as a timber outbuilding, with the space above the link to the house providing some visual separation between the two. The extension follows the main front building line and, although it is on slightly higher ground, its mono-pitched roof slopes gently back down towards the cottage, echoing the natural gradient of the land. Therefore, while contemporary in form, the extension has an unassuming visual presence and sits comfortably next to the traditional cottage in views from the road. A two-storey dwelling, Rising Sun, on the other side of the appeal site has a side element which is lower and smaller than the main house, and therefore appears subservient to it in the street scene.
5. A sizeable extension, with significant glazing at, Efo'r Grug, a nearby property, is presented by the appellant as having broad similarities with the appeal proposal.¹ However, as I observed on site, and as is evident from a photograph supplied by the appellant, that extension is subordinate in height to the large main house, with much of it below road level. Consequently, it does not appear prominent in the street scene. While there are some more recently built dwellings in the immediate vicinity, including one still under construction opposite the appeal site, they are different in form and design from the appeal proposal and on the other side of the road, where the land falls away, which makes them discrete from the appeal site and its more immediate context.
6. The proposed design for the appeal dwelling is based on the concept of a 'traditional' house which has subsequently been extended with a 'modern' wing. While the design of the traditionally styled main house makes reference to some dwellings along the road, the contemporary wing would appear as if artificially elevated and set on a pedestal, rather than responding to the natural slope of the land. Its footprint would be almost as large as the main house and, although single storey, its pitched roof would reach the ridge height of the two-storey section. In addition, the metal-clad form of the 'modern' part would protrude significantly in front of the façade of the 'traditional' element and be sited at 90 degrees to it. Consequently, the 'modern' wing would appear overly dominant in relation to the main house, which is untypical of the relationship between other houses and extensions in the area, which are usually subservient to the main building. Although the dwelling would be set back from the road, the existing hedgerow screening would be reduced by the removal of two hawthorn trees, necessary to accommodate a widened access, which is likely to increase visibility from public vantage points.
7. As a result of the above aspects, the composition of the dwelling would appear prominent and incongruous, set against the more balanced proportions, form, and design of other houses along the road, including those with extensions. The prominence of the large contemporary wing, with its glazed façade, would also be likely to be accentuated at night when the living space would be illuminated. Furthermore, the position of the building angled across the plot would be at odds with the orientation of many of the other houses in the area which, for the most part, face towards the road. In combination, the factors which I have described would result in a development that would appear discordant and visually intrusive, to the detriment of the character and appearance of this part of the PCNP.
8. The appellant suggests that, if necessary, the materials for the contemporary wing could be altered so that stone/render and slate is used to match the main house, to be

¹ Approved under ref: NP/16/0113/FUL

secured by condition. However, in this case, I do not consider that changing the materials alone would be sufficient to mitigate the harm identified.

9. Overall, I conclude that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of this part of the PCNP. It follows that the scheme would conflict with Policies 8, 9, 14 and 30 of the PCNP Local Development Plan 2 (LDP)² which, amongst other things, seek to ensure that the special qualities of the PCNP are conserved and enhanced and indicate that development will not be permitted where it would cause visual intrusion resulting in an unacceptable adverse effect on the character of the area.

Other Matters

10. In addition to those dealt with above, I have considered other examples of modern buildings and extensions within Newport and the surrounding area, cited by the appellant. However, while there are broad similarities between some of those schemes and the appeal proposal, mainly with regard to high levels of glazing, they do not form part of the immediate street scene in which the appeal site is located and, therefore, have limited direct relevance. In any event, all proposals must be judged on their individual site-specific merits, which is the approach I have taken in determining this appeal.
11. Although I note the appellant's concerns about the way in which the PCNPA reached its decision, I have considered the appeal proposal afresh and exercised my own independent judgment based on the evidence before me, including the PCNPA Officer's Report recommending approval and the relevant Development Management Committee (DMC) meeting minutes.³

Conclusion

12. While the appellant submits that the proposed burying of an overhead cable, currently visible across the site, would have a positive impact on the immediate landscape, that would not outweigh the overall harm to the character and appearance of the area. In any case, that improvement could form part of an alternative scheme.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 ('the Act'). I consider that this decision is in accord with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Minister's well-being objectives as required by section 8 of the Act.

JP Tudor

INSPECTOR

² Adopted September 2020

³ Dated 21 October 2020



Penderfyniad ar yr Apêl

Ymweliad â safle a wnaed ar 09/03/21

gan **J P Tudor, BA (Hons), Cyfreithiwr
(ddim yn ymarfer)**

Arolygydd a benodir gan Weinidogion Cymru

Dyddiad: 31/3/21

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 09/03/21

by **J P Tudor, BA (Hons), Solicitor (non-
practising)**

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Date: 31st March 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/L9503/D/21/3268451

Site address: 23 Scandinavia Heights, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9PE

The Welsh Ministers have transferred the authority to decide this appeal to me as the appointed Inspector.

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Tom Young against the decision of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.
- The application Ref: NP/20/0379/FUL dated 10 August 2020, was refused by notice dated 17 November 2020.
- The development proposed is balcony to rear, new roof to conservatory, with window and door alterations.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for balcony to rear, new roof to conservatory, with window and door alterations at 23 Scandinavia Heights, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9PE in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref: NP/20/0379/FUL dated 10 August 2020, subject to the attached schedule of conditions.

Preliminary Matter

2. Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority (PCNPA) expresses concern about the proposed balcony but has not objected to other elements of the proposal. I see no reason to take a different view in relation to those other elements. Therefore, this decision focuses on the effect of the proposed rear balcony.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed rear balcony on the living conditions of neighbouring residents with regard to privacy.

Reasons

4. The appeal property comprises a detached house and grounds in an elevated position within a residential development on the outskirts of Saundersfoot. The house is split-level, being single storey to the front and two-storeys to the rear, with the lounge, kitchen, and dining areas at first floor level. Pleasant views towards the coast are available from the rear upper floor windows of the house.

5. Policy 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 (LDP)¹ indicates that development will not be permitted where it has an unacceptable effect on amenity, particularly where it would have a detrimental impact on the quality of the environment currently enjoyed by people living in the Park.
6. PCPNA is concerned that the rear balcony would result in overlooking of private outdoor spaces or gardens of neighbouring properties at 21, 22 and 24 Scandinavia Heights, which would impinge on the privacy of occupiers and their enjoyment of those outdoor areas.
7. While I note those concerns, there are already views towards parts of the gardens and outdoor spaces of those adjacent properties from the rear upper floor windows of the appeal dwelling, including its projecting bay window.
8. No 21 is located roughly east of the appeal dwelling. Its outdoor space includes a sizeable tarmacked drive and parking area along with a raised tiered patio, which abuts the rear garden boundary wall of the appeal property. There are existing views of part of the parking area from first floor rear windows of the appeal dwelling, although the views are reasonably distant and the patio area is largely obscured by a boundary wall. However, as I observed on my site visit the patio and parking area are fully visible from both the bottom of the garden of the appeal property and from the public highway and footways to the north of No. 21. Therefore, while the balcony would be relatively sizeable and extend out from the existing first floor of the appeal dwelling, it would not significantly increase existing overlooking of outdoor areas at No 21.
9. The detached house at No. 22 stands on a corner plot alongside, but at a slight angle to, the appeal property. Although on a roughly similar rear building line the back elevation of the appeal dwelling stands just in front. Angled views towards parts of the garden of No. 22 can already be obtained from the existing lounge rear window of the appeal dwelling, with a more direct view from the northern side of the upper floor bay window. Although the balcony would be set in from the side elevation, as it would project out from the rear, the potential for overlooking would increase. That is recognised in the design of the balcony which includes a privacy screen on the side facing towards No. 22, which could be secured and retained by imposing suitable conditions. On that basis, there would be no significant increase in levels of overlooking. Indeed, views currently achievable from existing rear windows of the appeal dwelling towards No. 22 would be reduced by the proposed privacy screen.
10. Parts of the rear garden of the dwelling at No. 24, south of the appeal property, are already subject to clear views from the existing rear upper floor bay window at No. 23. Although the balcony would be positioned further away from No. 24, on the other side of the bay window, it would extend beyond the bay projection. The submitted plans do not propose a privacy screen at that end of the balcony. Although there is already overlooking through windows, given the proximity and extent of the balcony, neighbouring occupiers using their garden at No. 24 would be likely to be more aware of being overlooked by people sitting or standing outside on a balcony, potentially for long periods of time. While that could affect their enjoyment of their garden, any harm would be sufficiently mitigated by incorporating a privacy screen at the southern end of the balcony, which could be secured by condition. The appellant has already indicated that such a condition would be acceptable.

¹ September 2020

11. Overall therefore, with privacy screens at either end, the rear balcony would not significantly increase existing levels of overlooking towards the outdoor areas of adjacent properties or facilitate any intrusive views towards their habitable room windows.
12. I conclude, therefore, that the proposed development would not, subject to appropriate conditions, have a material adverse effect on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with regard to privacy. It follows that it would comply with LDP Policy 30 and the local development plan, considered as a whole.

Other Matters

13. In addition to the issue dealt with above, residents of No. 22 have expressed concern that the balcony would lead to overshadowing and a reduction in daylight or sunlight reaching ground and first floor rooms of their house. I viewed the appeal site from the interior of No. 22 during my site visit. The buildings stand alongside each other, albeit No. 22 is at an angle to the appeal property, with the rear elevation of No 22 being slightly behind the rear of No. 23.
14. Although projecting from first floor level at the rear, the balcony would be an open, relatively lightweight structure, consisting of a thin steel platform supported by two steel poles but otherwise glazed. The rear elevations of the two dwellings face generally eastward. Given the path of the sun, the relative position of the buildings and the extent, form, and materials of the proposed balcony structure, including its glazed privacy screens, I am satisfied that the balcony would not have a significant effect on sunlight or daylight reaching internal living areas at No. 22. I also note that PCNPA did not refuse the proposal because of any concerns about loss of natural light.
15. While I have considered other matters raised by residents of No. 22, including with regard to a previous balcony and the possibility of further development at the appeal property, along with alleged parking problems in the area, they are not directly relevant to the appeal proposal or its effects and, in any event, do not lead me to alter my decision.

Conditions

16. PCNPA has suggested conditions in the event that the appeal were allowed, which I have considered with regard to Welsh Government Circular 016/2014: 'The Use of Planning Conditions for Development Management'. The submitted plans only show one privacy screen. Therefore, as I consider that two are necessary for the reasons explained above, I have adjusted the wording of the plans condition (2) so that it defers to condition 3 in that regard. The appellant has indicated in appeal submissions that such a condition would be acceptable. I consider obscured glazing would be appropriate for the privacy screens, both aesthetically and to limit any loss of natural light passing through them, and have therefore adjusted PCNPA's suggested condition accordingly for clarity and certainty.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, subject to conditions.
18. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015 ('the Act'). I consider that this decision is in accord with the Act's sustainable development principle through its

contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Minister's well-being objectives as required by section 8 of the Act.

JP Tudor

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development shall begin not later than five years from the date of this decision.
Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
- 2) The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Land Registry Location Plan; ARW2002/AE01; ARW2002/AE02; 510-P 01; 510-P 02; 510-P 03; 510-P 04; and 510-P 05, except with regard to balcony privacy screens which shall be as specified in condition 3 below.
Reason: To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved documents, plans and drawings submitted with the application.
- 3) Before the development hereby permitted is brought into use, fixed, obscure glazed privacy screens shall be installed to both the north-west and south-east ends of the balcony. The privacy screens installed shall extend for the entirety of the length of the north-west and south-east ends of the balcony, rising to a minimum height of 1.7m for the entirety of their length. The obscured glazing to be used for the screens shall be obscured to a minimum of level 3 on the Pilkington scale of obscurity, and such obscurity will apply to the entire area of the glazed surface. The privacy screens shall be retained as such for the lifetime of the development.
Reason: In order to safeguard the privacy of neighbouring residents and in accordance with Policy 30 of the Local Development Plan 2.
- 4) Prior to the commencement of any works on site, details of the external design/appearance/materials/finishes and colours of replacement window casements and doors, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To ensure a proper standard of development and appearance in the interests of conserving the appearance and special qualities of the area in accordance with Policies 1, 14 and 29 of the Local Development Plan 2.
- 5) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
Reason: To ensure that the development hereby permitted does not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies 1, 14 and 29 of the Local Development Plan 2.
- 6) No external illumination shall be installed at the site without first securing the express written consent of the Authority. Any external lighting at the site should be low-level, hooded to direct all light spillage towards the ground, omit less than 600 lumens in intensity and operate on a PIR system. To be retained as such in perpetuity.
Reason: To ensure that animal and plant species which within the terms of the Conservation (Habitats 2c) Regulations 1994 are effectively protected and in the interests of preserving the amenity of the surrounding landscape in accordance with Policies 11 and 30 of the Local Development Plan 2.
- 7) Before first beneficial use of the development hereby approved, a biodiversity enhancement scheme, to include installation of 1 no. bird or bat box, shall be installed under the eaves or on the gable end of the dwelling, on an elevation

which does not feature any external lighting. To be retained as such in perpetuity.

Reason: In the interests of maintaining the special qualities of the landscape and habitats of the National Park through the protection, creation, and enhancement of links between sites and their protection for amenity, landscape, and biodiversity value. In accordance with Policies 1, 8, 11 and 14 of the Local Development Plan 2 and to comply with the Wildlife & Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and the Environment (Wales) Act 2016.

End of Schedule