

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

21st March, 2012

Present: Councillor SL Hancock (Chairman)
Mrs G Hayward and Mrs M Thomas, Messrs A Archer, D Ellis and
EA Sangster; Councillors JS Allen-Mirehouse, JA Brinsden, ML
Evans, HM George, M James, PJ Morgan, and M Williams.

(Ms C Gwyther joined the meeting during the Huf Haus presentation
[Minute 5 below refers].)

(Cleddau Bridge Hotel, Pembroke Dock: 10.00a.m. – 12.20p.m.)

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors RR Evans, RN
Hancock, RM Lewis and WL Raymond.

2. Disclosures of interest

The following Member(s)/Officer(s) disclosed an interest in the
application(s) and/or matter(s) referred to below:

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minute 8(b) below</i> NP/11/407 Replacement agricultural barn with ancillary educational uses – Fachongle Isaf, Cilgwyn, Newport	Councillor M Williams	Withdrew from the meeting while the matter was discussed
<i>Minute 8(c) below</i> NP/11/527 Installation of 15Kw wind turbine and associated foundation pad and underground cable – Philbeach Farm, Dale, Haverfordwest	Councillor JS Allen- Mirehouse	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minute 8(f) below</i> NP/12/0107 Temporary permission for the hire of sunloungers, deck chairs	Councillor ML Evans	Withdrew from the meeting while the matter was discussed



and wind breaks for a period of 3 years – The Slipway, Whitesands Beach, St Davids

<i>Minute 9(a) below</i> EC12/0013 Middle Hall, Talbenny, Haverfordwest– 2 static caravans – Enforcement	Mr D Ellis and Councillor SL Hancock	Withdrew from the meeting while the matter was discussed
---	--------------------------------------	--

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd February, 2012 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 22nd February, 2012 be confirmed and signed.

4. Right to speak at Committee

The Chairman informed Members that due notification (prior to the stipulated deadline) had been received from interested parties who wished to exercise their right to speak at the meeting that day. He added that, following the decision of the National Park Authority at its meeting held on the 7th December 2011, speakers on planning applications received up to the 31st December 2011 would have 3 minutes to address the Committee, while speakers on planning applications received after the 1st January 2012 would – under the new arrangements – have 5 minutes to speak:

Reference number	Proposal	Speaker
NP/11/407 <i>Minute 8(b) refers</i>	Replacement agricultural barn with ancillary educational uses – Fachongle Isaf, Cilgwyn, Newport	Ms V Moller (Applicant)
NP/11/527 <i>Minute 8(c) refers</i>	Installation of 15kw wind turbine and associated foundation pad and underground cable – Philbeach Farm, Dale	Mr P Smithies (Applicant) Community Councillor C Jessop (Supporter)
NP/12/0048 <i>Minute 8(d)</i>	Replacement roof, windows and doors to	Mr P Roach (Applicant)



the Lesser Hall area of
Carew Castle, Carew

5. Huf Haus presentation

Members were reminded that officers had, under the Committee's delegated procedures, granted planning permission in late 2011 for the erection of a "Huf Haus" dwelling in Northcliffe, Tenby. Members had, at the time, enquired whether a presentation could be made to Committee in due course on the Huf Haus concept, and the Director of Park Direction and Planning was now pleased to introduce Mr Peter Huf, whose family established and developed the concept of energy efficient timber framed homes. He was accompanied by Mr Andrew Armour, who was the applicant and who had commissioned the design.

Mr Huf provided Members with a brief history of how the business had started in 1912 and how it had developed over the last 100 years. He explained that each house was individually designed as every plot of land was different, and the company's aim was to build a home that fitted into the site as well as possible. He also stated that, over the years, the company had invested in energy saving techniques so that each new home was now four times more energy efficient than 50-year old homes. He added that the structural life expectancy of a Huf Haus was approximately 100 years.

In conclusion, he wished to thank the planning officers for their support and for being so straightforward in dealing with the planning application.

The Chairman thanked both Mr Huf and Mr Armour for attending the meeting and for their extremely informative presentation.

6. Planning Applications received since the last meeting

The Director of Park Direction and Planning reminded Members of the protocol that had been introduced whereby "new" applications would now be reported to Committee for information. These "new" applications were ones that had been received since preparation of the previous agenda and were either to be dealt with under Officers' delegated powers or at a subsequent meeting of the Development Management Committee. The details of these 49 applications were, therefore, reported for information and Members were informed that 21 were deemed to be invalid.

NOTED

7. Human Rights Act

The Head of Legal Services reminded the Committee that the Human Rights Act provided that, from the 2nd October 2000; the rights set out in



the European Convention on Human Rights are accessible direct in the British Courts.

The Act required that, as far as was possible, existing legislation had to be read and given effect in a way which was compatible with the Convention rights. Furthermore, it would be unlawful for public authorities to act in a way that was incompatible with Convention rights.

In the planning sphere, relevant rights could attach both to applicants for planning permission, and also to third parties who might be adversely affected by a proposed development. Consequently it was essential that the way in which the Authority decided planning issues was characterised by fairness, and that the Authority struck a fair balance between the public interest, as reflected in the Town and Country Planning legislation, and individual rights and interests.

Accordingly, the following reports of the Head of Development Management, which were before Members that day, had been prepared with express and due regard to the Convention on Human Rights. In particular:

- A. In assessing each application, every effort had been made to consider, and place before Members, all the arguments put forward:
 - (i) by those seeking planning permission;
 - (ii) by those opposing the grant of planning permission, and
 - (iii) by those suggesting conditions deemed appropriate if permission was to be granted.

- B. Each planning application to be considered by the Committee was the subject of an individual Appraisal and Recommendation. These embraced a balancing of any competing interest.

It was **RESOLVED** that the report of the Head of Legal Services be noted.

8. Reports of the Director of Park Direction and Planning

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Director of Park Direction and Planning, wherein were listed the comments of various organisations that had been consulted on a number of applications for planning permission. Upon consideration of all available information, which included late representations that were reported verbally at the meeting, the Committee determined the applications as recorded below (*the decision reached on each follows the details of the relevant application*):



- (a) REFERENCE: NP/11/370
APPLICANT: Mr Ian Griffiths
PROPOSAL: Change of use to provide bunkhouse accommodation and ancillary service areas, parking and wet weather facilities
LOCATION: Pwllcaerog, Berea, Haverfordwest

Members were informed that the site lay within a secluded coastal location to the northeast of St Davids in an area known as Berea and comprised a traditional two storey farmhouse building and a number of former agricultural buildings on the site known as 'Pwllcaerog Farm'.

The application had been reported to the Development Management Committee at the request of the Head of Development Management due to the extent of works already carried out, and the fact that the application had been submitted as a result of an enforcement investigation.

Officers reported that they had been alerted, in March 2011, by the Building Control Section of Pembrokeshire County Council, that various works and uses were being carried out at the site without the benefit of planning permission. Officers visited the site and noted that outbuildings had been converted into bunkhouses as well as other works which provided for new kitchen facilities and a stage. It was clear from the Authority's investigations that the use of the site being carried out was not the lawful or approved use.

Through his submission the owner had explained that the site, which was owned by the National Trust, had been used for intensive agriculture for arable and livestock purposes for the last two decades. However as part of the ongoing farm diversification plan there had been an initial gradual move towards bunkhouse/educational/activity accommodation, which had escalated in the previous 12 months.

The application had been submitted in an attempt to retain the overall use of the site as a farm diversification scheme to provide for bunkhouse, educational and activity accommodation at the site as well as the erection of new extensions and alterations to a number of buildings, the details of which were set out in the report before Members that day.

Officers felt that the scheme allowed the continuation and expansion of what was considered to be an acceptable farm diversification scheme at the site. The extensions and alterations proposed to the existing buildings had been appropriately designed such that they would match the character and appearance of the buildings and the general site. These would not appear incongruous in the surrounding landscape nor adversely



impact on the amenity of others. However, the static caravans proposed to be used at the site could only be justified for temporary permission in order to allow the business to assess the suitability of existing buildings on site to provide the accommodation.

Members had concerns that the historic features of the farmhouse would be compromised and wanted to make sure that any alterations would be done in a sympathetic manner requiring the use of traditionally painted wooden windows, cast iron rainwater goods and the use of lime mortar and natural slate.

Members also questioned the impact of the development on neighbouring properties. Officers confirmed that there had been a complaint regarding noise from a neighbouring property and Members asked that a condition be imposed which would require the kitchen, bar and stage areas to have, amongst other things, restricted opening times.

Members also wished to ensure that a formal response was received from the Highway Authority prior to the issue of a Decision Notice and that any conditions suggested by the Highway Authority be included.

DECISION: That Planning Permission be granted subject to the conditions stipulated in the report before Members that day, and the following conditions:

- (a) Use of traditional materials to include traditionally painted wooden windows, cast iron rainwater goods and the use of lime mortar and natural slate;**
- (b) The multipurpose entertainment area, communal dining area, kitchen, stage and bar facilities should have restricted opening/use hours, and**
- (c) Any conditions required by the Highway Authority.**

[Councillor M Williams abstained from voting on the above-mentioned decision.]

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/11/407
- APPLICANT: Ms Vicky Moller
- PROPOSAL: Replacement agricultural barn with ancillary educational uses
- LOCATION: Fachongle Isaf, Cilgwyn, Newport

Officers reported that the application was being reported to the Development Management Committee as the recommendation of Officers differed to that of Nevern Community Council, who had no objections.



Members were informed that the site lay on a parcel of land within the residential curtilage of a farm holding known as Fachongle Isaf in Cilgwyn. The application had been submitted in retrospect, and followed a previously refused planning application which proposed the retention and completion of a new building at the site.

The barn had been erected on land near the main site access behind an existing smaller flat roof structure. The barn was positioned on a levelled surface which was at a lower level than the highway along with a static caravan. There was an existing vehicular access into the garden and the main dwelling lay to the north of the building. The building was proposed to be retained for use as a workshop and for storage and for agricultural and educational uses. The application was a resubmission of a similar scheme refused under application reference NP/10/555 on 9th February 2011. Officers were of the opinion that the applicant had not overcome the fundamental reason for refusal in that the development was considered to be of a scale and appearance which was detrimental to the special qualities of the National Park. This revised scheme was therefore recommended for refusal and Officers advised that the fact that the barn had already been erected should not be used as a reason for granting approval.

Furthermore Officers felt there was a lack of information in respect of the educational use introduced within the application to allow full consideration of its potential impact upon the amenity of the surrounding area, highway safety and sustainable transport provision. Officers went on to say that the applicant had suggested introducing a landscaping scheme to screen the building, but the proposal was not considered to be adequate.

Ms Vicky Moller, the Applicant, spoke to Committee. She advised Members that the barn was used for food production and storage for the community of Cilgwyn who felt very strongly that the barn should be retained as it was a benefit to the area. She had received fifteen letters of support which had not been mentioned in the Officers' report and these were circulated at the meeting for Members' attention, together with photographs of the building in question. She went on to say that traditional skills and materials had been used when erecting the barn, which was in keeping with the Authority's design guidance, although she had to point out that it currently had a temporary cladding to prevent it becoming weather damaged whilst awaiting the decision of the Development Management Committee. It sat on the same footprint as before although it was sited at a lower level. She confirmed that it was not used for educational purposes at the time of the application but she believed that all farms should be used to educate others.



Ms Moller concluded by saying that the community felt very strongly about retaining the barn as there was a need for large harvests to be stored locally. She was more than willing to discuss a way forward with officers which would address their concerns while also meeting the aspirations of the community of Cilgwyn.

Members sought clarification on what was allowable in relation to agricultural barns and Officers informed them that it was dependent on the extent of the land in the ownership of the applicant. When questioned, the applicant stated that she owned approximately 10 acres and her daughter further land in the vicinity. Officers went on to say that ancillary buildings should be subservient to the existing building, which was not the case in this instance.

Members also sought clarification on whether or not this was a “replacement barn” and Officers confirmed that there had originally been a building on site which had been removed and replaced with the current structure. Members then enquired as to how this building compared to what was on site originally and were informed that as Ms Moller had stated it was on a similar footprint but sited at a lower level. Members were reminded that because the previous building had been demolished, its use in planning terms had, as a result, been lost therefore Members could not consider that fact in relation to the building currently on site.

While Members felt that the barn was not out of context in terms of scale and height they felt that the current red roof colour was visually intrusive. They felt that a dark green colour would blend in more with the locality. Officers reminded Members that the barn was not yet complete and one of the elements yet to be completed was the installation of solar panels on the south west facing roof and this would also lessen the visual intrusion and that Members should carefully consider their suggestion to change the roof colouring.

Following a discussion, Members considered that the structure was acceptable as it conformed with Chapter 4 of Planning Policy Wales Edition 4 (Planning for Sustainability) and Technical Advice Note 6 (Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities). They did, however, wish to ensure that the roofing material be changed to a dark green colour within a specified time frame.

DECISION: That Planning Permission be granted subject to standard conditions, together with a condition that the roof colour be changed to dark green within six months of the Decision Notice with a sample being supplied to Officers for approval prior to any change.



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/11/527
APPLICANT: Mr P Smithies
PROPOSAL: Installation of 15kw wind turbine and associated foundation pad and underground cable
LOCATION: Philbeach Farm, Dale, Haverfordwest

The application was being presented to Committee as the views of Officers differed to that of Marloes and St Brides Community Council.

Members were advised that Philbeach Farm was situated just off the classified road leading between Marloes and Dale. It was a traditional farmstead with the farm house being listed. The farm had recently been diversified into a mix of residential, holiday units and farming enterprise.

The applicant wanted the existing farming enterprise to become more sustainable and self sufficient in respect of electricity generation with the installation of a wind turbine and this application sought approval for a single 15kw turbine which had a three bladed design and would be sited within a field some 180 metres south west of the existing farm complex. The turbine would have an overall height of around 21 metres to the tip of the blade and be connected to the adjacent farm complex via an underground cable laid across the agricultural field and through the farm yard.

The structure would be situated within a landscape which was largely open and exposed, where there was little vertical context. Officers considered that the development would be detrimental to the special qualities of this part of the National Park and as such, it would be harmful to public enjoyment of the Park.

The Director of Park Direction and Planning referred to the report before Members that day and wished to draw attention to Page 26 under the heading "Current Proposal", where the sentence should read "The blade radius is 5.55 metres" rather than "The blade diameter is 5.55 metres". She then stated that it was with regret that this application was being recommended for refusal as Officers were generally supportive of such applications. However, Officers were obliged to consider the landscape and special qualities of the National Park first and foremost and, because of the impact the proposal would have on the surrounding area, Officers were recommending refusal.

The Director added that the applicant had commissioned consultants Soltysbrewster to look at the impact such a proposal would have on the landscape, and which had concluded a contrary view to that of Officers. This study, submitted during the application process, did not add anything



to the applicant's argument that would make Officers change their view of the application.

Mr Smithies, the Applicant, spoke to Committee. He stated that as his farmhouse was a Listed Building Cadw had insisted he only installed single glazed windows which resulted in high energy bills and this was the reason he wished to install the wind turbine. He added that he had used the supplementary planning guidance when choosing the location of the structure, and referred to the fact that his initial pre-application proposal for two wind turbines had been trimmed back to one, with the scale reduced as well. He now felt that the Officer's report was misleading, in that the skyline development of gas turbines on the Milford Haven Waterway were not mentioned, nor the fact that there was a live planning permission for a phone mast in the area, which would be higher than his proposed turbine. He added that there were also many telegraph poles in the area and these, together with the buildings at Dale Hill Farm all affected the surrounding landscape. He went on to say that he had received letters of support from local people and he was aware that he had the support of Marloes and St Brides Community Council together with the St Ishmaels Community Council. He then quoted the Chief Executive of the National Park Authority in saying that the role of the Authority continued to expand on delivering for Park communities and that it should give clear reasons for going against Community Council's advice on local matters. He also stated that the Authority had a statutory duty to foster the economic development of communities in the Park, and Mr Smithies was strongly of the opinion that to grant planning permission in this instance would give his family the opportunity to provide employment for people living in the Park.

Community Councillor Jessop who spoke on behalf of the Marloes and St Brides Community Council stated that, at the recent meeting of the Community Council, an unanimous decision was taken that Councillor Jessop speak in favour of this application. He reminded Members that there was already a wind turbine in St Brides and this had not led to any negative comments either from locals or visitors to the area. They believed that the chosen location did not have a pristine skyline due to the refinery chimneys, flare? stacks and the dilapidated remains of the airfield camp buildings. He felt that the owners were important employers within the community and were working hard to increase their sustainable working practices. He felt that this application should be allowed in order to enable the owners to compete in the face of hard marketing conditions.

The Director of Park Direction and Planning advised Members that they should not only look at the effect on the landscape of this wind turbine but they should consider the cumulative effect on the skyline of this and other existing structures.



Members stated that they were not against wind turbines *per se*, but there were areas where such proposals would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and special qualities of the National Park. They accepted the applicant's assertion that the Authority had a statutory duty to foster the economic well-being of its communities, but only provided that it was compatible with its statutory purposes. They considered that it was difficult to assess the visual impact of the development from pictures and plans and felt that a site visit would be appropriate in this case. They also queried whether the colour of the turbine could be a condition of the granting of planning permission and the Director of Park Direction and Planning advised that it could.

DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow Members to carry out a site inspection.

Prior to Member's consideration of the following item the Authority's Solicitor drew attention to the fact that three of the Authority's final four applications were ones in which the Authority had an interest. The Solicitor reminded Members that when deciding such applications they must ignore any interest the Authority had in them and determine the applications solely on their planning merits.

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/12/0048
APPLICANT: Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
PROPOSAL: Replacement roof, windows and doors to the Lesser Hall area of Carew Castle
LOCATION: Carew Castle, Birds Lane, Carew, Tenby

Members were informed that this application was before the Development Management Committee because the proposal had been submitted on behalf of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.

Carew Castle lay at the head of the Carew estuary and was leased to the Authority from the Carew Estate. Although positioned at a low level, it was a prominent landmark within the landscape. The Authority managed the site through conservation, encouraging understanding and enjoyment by the public. It was a Scheduled Ancient Monument and Listed Building; the site was also a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and was set within a Historic Landscape.

Funding had been secured for a scheme of repair, renewal and improvement to replace the roof, windows and doors to the Lesser Hall, remove the existing portakabins from the Walled Garden, upgrade and



extend Dennis' Shed in the Walled Garden to provide a retail/reception facility and public conveniences and also to resurface the main car park.

The planning application before Members that day proposed only the first element of the works to the Lesser Hall, i.e. that of replacing the roof, windows and doors, with some minor works to replace missing stonework, replace and update downpipes for better drainage plus temporary works required in connection with construction. The remaining works would be the subject of separate planning applications. The proposals had been developed in close consultation with the relevant Officers of the Authority, the Countryside Council for Wales (CCW) and Cadw to ensure the best possible outcome for the Lesser Hall and the site's historical and ecological importance. A separate application for Scheduled Ancient Monument Consent had also been made directly to Cadw.

The proposed improvements were considered by Officers to be a welcome upgrade to the existing temporary roof, windows and doors to ensure the enhancement and future preservation of an important historical asset in this part of the National Park. However, due to the time constraints for grant funding for the proposed works, at the time of completing the Committee report not all consultation responses had been received, although both Cadw and the Dyfed Archaeological Trust had indicated that they had no objections. The Authority's Building Conservation Officer had felt it inappropriate to comment on this application as he had been involved in the initial stages of the application.

As there was to be no Development Management Committee in April 2012 and in order to ensure that the opportunity for funding was not delayed, Officers recommended that the Chief Executive (National Park Officer), Director of Park Direction and Planning or Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission for this development, subject to appropriate conditions and subject to no valid planning objections being received (which could not be overcome by condition).

Mr Phil Roach, the Head of Discovery for the National Park Authority addressed the Committee. He informed Members that there had been many proposals put forward for Carew Castle in the past and he had every confidence that this one could be delivered. This however was only the first part of the package with other applications to follow and these would be presented at a future Development Management Committee. He gave Members a brief synopsis of the work to be done.

Members were pleased to see this application before them and felt that Carew Castle would benefit immensely from the improvements and could be an even bigger draw to the public in the future.



DECISION: That the Chief Executive (National Park Officer), Director of Park Direction and Planning or Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to appropriate conditions and subject to no valid planning objections (which could not be overcome by condition) being received as a result of the consultation process.

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/12/0101
APPLICANT: Ms Alison Mott
PROPOSAL: Alterations and extensions, replacement dormer windows and new rooflights
LOCATION: Vine Cottage, Goat Street, Newport

Members were advised that the application site was a semi-detached traditional cottage located on the north side of Goat Street, Newport and was within the Newport Conservation Area. The cottage was predominantly constructed in stone, with the exception of the rear lean-to kitchen/utility room and side garage which were more modern additions with roughcast render finish.

The application had been brought before the Committee for determination as the views of Newport Town Council differed to those of Officers.

The original proposal involved the demolition of a single storey rear lean-to extension and construction of a kitchen /dining room extension, and a front porch. The rear extension would be overtly modern in design which was aimed at complementing the traditional cottage structure with modern sustainable materials. The front porch was to be more traditional in appearance with a slate roof, rendered walls and painted timber windows and door. However Officers informed Members that because of the objection of the Newport Town Council to the front porch design the applicant had withdrawn this element from the application and the only matter now under consideration was the acceptability of the rear extension. Whilst incorporating modern features and materials in the rear extension Officers felt the proposed developments did not impact adversely on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area as the rear was not readily visible from any public vantage point.

Members were pleased that the porch had been removed from the application; however they asked that it be a condition of the granting of planning permission that the velux rooflight also be removed from the front of the property.

DECISION: It was resolved that the Chief Executive (National Park Officer), Director of Park Direction and Planning or Head of



Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to appropriate conditions, including a condition to remove the velux rooflight from the front of the property, and subject to no valid planning objections (which could not be overcome by condition) being received as a result of the consultation process.

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/12/0107
APPLICANT: Mr Shaun Thompson
PROPOSAL: Temporary permission for the hire of sunloungers, deck chairs and wind breaks for a period of three years
LOCATION: The Slipway, Whitesands Beach, St Davids

The application was before Committee as, although the application was submitted by a private concern, the land involved was in National Park Authority ownership.

Members were advised that the site was located adjacent to the slipway at Whitesands Beach on the western side of the large public car park. The immediate surrounding area provided the bulk of facilities for visitors to the beach, with toilets, cafe, lifeguard station and access slipway all in close proximity. Temporary planning permission for a site for the seasonal hire of sun loungers, deck chairs and windbreaks had been approved on a rolling basis since 2005. The most recent planning permission had lapsed, and the current application sought permission to continue the activity for three years. The use did not require any permanent structures, and had no lasting impact on the character and appearance of the area. No adverse comments had been received to date regarding the use, which provided an additional fine weather facility at this popular beach and Officers recommended that permission be granted for a three year period.

DECISION: It was resolved that the Chief Executive (National Park Officer), Director of Park Direction and Planning or Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission, subject to appropriate conditions and subject to no valid planning objections (which could not be overcome by condition) being received as a result of the consultation process.

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/12/0114
APPLICANT: Mrs Libby Taylor
PROPOSAL: Interpretation Panel
LOCATION: Picnic Area, Skrinkle Haven, Manorbier

Members were advised that this application was brought before the Development Management Committee as it proposed to erect an



Information Panel on land which was in the ownership of the National Park Authority. The panel would be 900mm x 600mm set on timber posts at a maximum height of 1350mm and where possible would be produced using local materials. The scale and design of the structure was not considered to be visually obtrusive and no objections to the siting had been received to date. Consequently Officers felt that the application was considered to comply with the relevant policies of the Local Development Plan and could be supported.

DECISION: It was resolved that the Chief Executive (National Park Officer), Director of Park Direction and Planning or Head of Development Management be authorised to grant planning permission for this development, subject to appropriate conditions and subject to no valid planning objections (which could not be overcome by condition) being received as a result of the consultation process.

9. Enforcement

(a) EC12/0013 Middle Hall, Talbenny, Haverfordwest – 2 static caravans

On a routine visit to the Talbenny area Enforcement Officers noted that two static caravans had been sited in an agricultural field at the above location. Both caravans appeared to have all the facilities to enable them to be used as separate independent units of accommodation. A check of records revealed that the necessary planning approval of the National Park Authority had neither been sought nor given for these caravans to be placed on the land.

A letter and Planning Contravention Notice was served on the owner of Middle Mill Farm on the 31st January 2012 by registered post. The notice was to be completed and returned to the Authority by 22nd February 2012 however no communication had been received regarding the matter.

In view of the above a further letter was dispatched by recorded delivery on the 28th February 2012 giving the owner a further 7 days to complete and return the Planning Contravention Notice, whilst also informing them that failure to complete and return the form was an offence answerable to in the Magistrates Court.

The Head of Park Direction and Planning informed Members that the Planning Contravention Notice had now been received by the Authority and no further action by the Committee was required at this stage.

NOTED.



(b) EC12/0030 Royal Gatehouse Hotel, White Lion Street, Tenby – Untidy land

At the Development Management Committee of 22 February 2012 Members raised concern at the condition of land at the site of the former Royal Gatehouse Hotel in Tenby and requested that a report on the matter was brought back to them. In view of the concern raised by Members an Officer visited the site on 23rd February 2012 to take note of its condition.

Whilst Officers felt that the site was in a generally poor condition it was not considered to be in an adverse condition which impacted to an unacceptable degree on the amenity of the surrounding area. The site was bordered by metal hoarding around its main perimeter and whilst it was overgrown within it was not largely visible from public view. The hoarding served a purpose in preventing views into the site and also providing a security measure. This hoarding was felt to be in a clean and generally unmarked condition and whilst it had been damaged slightly in parts Officers considered it would be difficult to conclusively argue that this was detrimental to surrounding amenities. Any Notice served would require an action to remedy the harm and its removal would result in far more exposure of the site and impact upon amenity than the current situation.

Although the buildings at the site had started to fall into disrepair Officers felt that they were not yet considered to be in a condition which warranted further action. Due to the recently granted planning permissions and the knowledge that the applicant was currently pursuing financing for the development of the site Officers considered it would not be reasonable to pursue further action at this time.

The Director of Park Direction and Planning informed Members that since writing the report Officers had received a letter from Tenby Town Council expressing its concern over the state of the site. It considered that while the overgrown area behind the hoarding was not visible at the present time this would worsen during the summer months. It also expressed concern that very little progress had been made with the development in the previous four years. The Town Council had requested a meeting with Officers from both the National Park Authority and Pembrokeshire County Council in order to move progress.

Officers also updated Members that the owner of the site had decided not to appeal the decision to refuse planning permission to vary the conditions of a previous planning permission for the Royal Playhouse Cinema but instead would remarket the site. He had also agreed to cut and treat all weeds behind the hoardings and would keep Officers updated with regard to funding for the development.



One Member felt strongly that the site had a hugely negative impact on local businesses and on the whole town in general. He felt that the hoardings were in extremely bad condition and that something should be done about them immediately. Other Members felt that this should be a lesson for the future when hoarding was to be used in historically important areas and in tourist areas and that Members should be specific regarding what could and could not be used. One Member felt that it would be regrettable if Members were to allow this situation to continue.

The Director of Park Direction and Planning stated that she would respond in writing to the Town Council's concerns, although she considered at present it would be too onerous on the application to address the situation for – as far as Officers were concerned – the situation was a work in progress and the developers were trying to progress matters.

Following a discussion, it was **RESOLVED** that no action be pursued under Section 215 of the Town and Country Planning Act (1990).

10. Appeals

The Director of Park Direction and Planning reported on 12 appeals (against planning decisions made by the Authority) that were currently lodged with the Welsh Government, and detailed which stage of the appeal process had been reached to date in every case.

Members were advised that the appeal on NP/11/185 – Conversion of outbuilding to dwelling – The Old Cottage, Llanvirn, Berea had been dismissed, the details of which would be brought to the next Development Management Committee for information.

Members were also informed that the appeal on The Welcome Inn, Castlemartin, Pembroke had also been dismissed. The Appeal Decision stated that the front elevation “appeared fussy, lacked unity and was disproportionate, and the distribution and shape of the fenestration was poorly devised”. The Director of Park Direction and Planning requested Members note that the Planning Inspector had agreed with Officers’ opinions on design details in this case, thus emphasising the need for good quality design in the National Park.

NOTED.

11. Delegated applications/notifications

Thirty one applications/notifications had been issued since the last meeting under the delegated powers scheme that had been adopted by the Committee, the details of which were reported for Members’



information. Of the 31, it was reported that one application had been refused, one cancelled and three withdrawn. The Director of Park Direction and Planning stated that this was a good approval rate and was contrary to the perception held by some that the National Park Authority always restricted development.

NOTED.

