

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

18th July, 2012

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)
Mr D Ellis, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor P Harries, Councillor M James,
Councillor L Jenkins, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor A Lee,
Councillor RM Lewis, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens,
Councillor D Rees, Mr EA Sangster, Mrs M Thomas, Councillor M
Williams.

1. Apologies

Mr A Archer, Councillor JA Brinsden and Councillor A Wilcox

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>Minutes 7(d) and 7(e) below</i> NP/12/0225 & NP/12/0240 Erection of attached garden store – Cromlech House, Newport	Mrs G Hayward & Mr Paul Harries	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 16th May, 2012 and 20th June, 2012 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on the 16th May, 2012 and 20th June, 2012 be confirmed and signed.

NOTED.

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. She 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/11/368 <i>Minute 7(a) refers</i>	Conversion of existing stone-walled barn to holiday let – Beavers Hill Farm, The Ridgeway, Manorbier	Mr Michael Howlett (Agent)
NP/11/405 <i>Minute 7(b) refers</i>	Conversion of existing redundant barn into a holiday let – Beavers Hill Farm, The Ridgeway, Manorbier	Mr Michael Howlett (Agent)
NP/12/0201 <i>Minute 7(c) refers</i>	Demolition of 11 existing chalets and erection of 11 replacement dwelling units with attendant landscaping and access works – Llwyngwair Manor, Newport	Mr Andrew Rees (Objector) Mr Irvine Johnston (Agent)
NP/12/0225 & NP/12/0240 <i>Minute 7(d) and 7(e) Refers</i>	Erection of attached garden store – Cromlech House, Newport	F C Ruel (Objector) Irvine Johnston (Agent)
NP/12/0258 <i>Minute 7(k) Refers</i>	Reserved matters application for consideration of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale, for a 3-bed dwelling one-and-a-half storey house – land at Coedmor Field, Dinas Cross	Mr R Harries (Supporter)
NP/12/0314 <i>Minute 7(l) Refers</i>	Improvement and reconfiguration of Solva Car Park and Associated works, in addition to providing a single storey storage shed to be sited adjacent to existing toilet block – Solva Car Park, Main Street, Solva	Mrs Jenny Davies (Community Council) Mrs Bella Prickett (Business Community of Solva) Mr Andrew Muskett (Agent)



5. Planning Applications received since the last meeting

The Head of Development Management 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 45 applications were, therefore, reported for information and Members were informed that 20 were deemed to be invalid.

Members were informed that a Scoping Opinion request had been received in relation to Combined Heat and Power Plant at South Hook LNG in Herbrandston. The deadline for response to this Scoping Opinion was 25th July and a formal submission was likely to be made early next year. Members requested that the response to the Scoping Opinion be reported to the next Development Management Meeting for information.

A pre-app had been submitted for Atlantic Array Windfarm Project which required a response by the end of August 2012. This response would also be reported back to the Development Management Committee.

NOTED

6. Human Rights Act

The Solicitor 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.

The Solicitor emphasised that once the Committee has all appropriate information it falls to the Members to make the final judgement, bearing in mind all relevant factors and disregarding all irrelevant matters.

It was **RESOLVED** that the report of the Solicitor be noted.

7. Report of the Head of Development Management

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Head of Development Management, together with any updates reported verbally on the day and recorded below. The Committee determined the applications as follows (*the decision reached on each follows the details of the relevant application*):

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/11/368
APPLICANT: Mr C Izzard
PROPOSAL: Conversion of existing stone-walled barn to holiday let
LOCATION: Beavers Hill Farm, The Ridgeway, Manorbier, Tenby

Members were advised that this application was on the agenda as the recommendation was contrary to the view expressed by the Community Council.

This application was one of two applications brought before Members seeking planning permission for the conversion of barns into holiday lets (*see 7(b) below*). This application related to a redundant single storey farm building which lay at Beavers Hill Farm and opposite the main farmhouse dwelling. Planning Permission had recently been granted for a replacement dwelling adjoining the application building (NP/11/367). This application proposed the conversion of an existing stone walled long barn at the site into a single holiday let.



The Case Officer felt that whilst the scheme offered the opportunity of bringing a redundant farm building into a new use Policy 7 of the Local Development Plan required that conversions would be judged against accessibility to Centres within the plan. The site lay a distance of 1.22km from the nearest settlement or bus route where the Authority identified the maximum distance for suitable accessible walking and cycling travel to be 1km. It was felt that in view of the policy framework the application failed to provide the required level of accessibility and would be contrary to both Local and National Planning Policies. He felt that there were no material considerations which would outweigh the Local Development Plan. Also the applicant had not advised that the development would meet affordable housing needs and accordingly the scheme was recommended for refusal.

Mr Michael Howlett addressed Committee in his capacity as agent to the applicant. He urged Members not to refuse the application based solely on one measure of the Local Development Plan. He felt that the level of emissions from vehicular travel would be offset by negative emissions from the property itself. He also believed that anyone staying in the property would be unlikely to travel a long distance by car due to the close proximity of beaches at Manorbier and Tenby. He informed Members that as this property would be used as a holiday let it would not be occupied for the entire year although the panel would continue to feed into the national grid even when unoccupied. He confirmed that owners of the property had lived and worked on the land for generations and would be creating local jobs for tradesmen while the property was being converted and also local employment when the holiday let was up and running.

Members felt that while the development did not fit the criteria on accessibility there were other considerations in relation to policy which it did fit. They also took into account the fact that the development would only be 300 yards beyond the 1km distance set. They felt tourism industries in rural communities should be supported and felt it was encouraging to see redundant buildings brought back into use. They believed that as this was to be used for holiday use it would not be travel intensive (i.e. no school or work runs etc.)

One Member felt that there was a lack of detail on the design but it was felt that this could be dealt with by way of condition.

Sarah Middleton, Planning Officer (Park Direction) of Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority addressed Members. She advised that this development should not be looked at simply on the basis of sustainability but also on the basis of accessibility. She felt that in the future, due to



high fuel prices people would want to use cars less. She disagreed that tourists were not travel intensive as there were a large number of cars on the roads in Pembrokeshire in the summer. She explained that there needed to be a benchmark and the 1km distance was supported by the Institute of Chartered Surveyors. She understood that in some circumstances there could be material considerations that could outweigh this but didn't feel it was applicable in this case. Having spoken to the Building Conservation Officer, it was felt that the building did not have a significant aesthetic or historic value.

Members then enquired whether the affordable housing policy applied and were informed that if planning permission were granted it would be subject to the commuted sum payment if for full residential use. (In this case the application was for a holiday let).

Overall Members felt that there were sufficient material benefits in terms of sustainability and supporting the rural economy to outweigh the accessibility issues.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions including a condition to provide further detailing on the grounds that:

- 1. The overall sustainability benefits of the project outweigh the single issue of the site being inaccessible.**
- 2. The proposal provides an opportunity to restore a traditional building and convert it to a productive new use.**
- 3. The proposal would contribute to the local tourism/rural economy.**
- 4. The consideration of proposals of this nature was finely balanced between the strict adherence to policy and other material considerations. In this case it is felt that the material considerations listed in 1-3 above outweighed the policy principles.**

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/11/405
APPLICANT: Mr J Izzard
PROPOSAL: Conversion of existing redundant barn into a holiday let
LOCATION: Beavers Hill Farm, The Ridgeway, Manorbier, Tenby

This application was on the agenda as the recommendation was contrary to the view expressed by the Community Council.

This application was one of two applications brought before Members seeking planning permission for the conversion of barns into holiday lets (see 7(a) above). This application related to a two storey farm building at Beavers Hill Farm on the south east boundary of the site. This application



proposed the conversion of an existing stone walled long barn at the site into a holiday let. It was proposed to retain the window openings on the south elevation of the building which faced onto a small paddock of land. Three new rooflights were proposed on this elevation along with the reconstruction and roofing of an adjoining building.

The Case Officer felt that whilst the scheme offered the opportunity of bringing a redundant farm building into a new use Policy 7 of the Local Development Plan required that conversions would be judged against accessibility to Centres within the plan. The site lay a distance of 1.22km from the nearest settlement or bus route where the Authority identified the maximum distance for suitable accessible walking and cycling travel to be 1km. It was felt that in view of the policy framework the application failed to provide the required level of accessibility and would be contrary to both Local and National Planning Policies. The Case Officer felt that there were no material considerations which would outweigh the Local Development Plan. The applicant had not advised that the development would meet affordable housing needs and accordingly the scheme was recommended for refusal.

Mr Michael Howlett addressed Committee in his capacity as agent to the applicant. He reiterated his comments from the previous application (7(a)). He did not feel that sustainability should be used as a trump card on every occasion but felt that if you could supply the tourist with an environmentally friendly building it would attract a sector of the tourist industry who were more likely to walk or cycle rather than use cars – the “eco-tourist”.

Members took into account what had been said in the previous application. They queried the number of openings on the rear elevation as it was felt that there were too many but the Case Officer informed them that these were the original openings.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions, on the grounds that:

- 1. The overall sustainability benefits of the project outweigh the single issue of the site being inaccessible.**
- 2. The proposal provides an opportunity to restore a traditional building and convert it to a productive new use.**
- 3. The proposal would contribute to the local tourism/rural economy.**
- 4. The consideration of proposals of this nature was finely balanced between the strict adherence to policy and other material considerations. In this case it was felt that the material considerations listed in 1-3 above outweighed the policy principles.**



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/12/0201
APPLICANT: Mr P Lowe, Evelyn Crescent Ltd
PROPOSAL: Demolition of 11 existing chalets and erection of 11 replacement dwelling units with attendant landscaping and access works
LOCATION: Llwyngwair Manor, Newport

This application was on the agenda as it was a major development in the National Park (ten or more dwellings).

The current application proposed the replacement of eleven chalets to the rear of the Llwyngwair Manor with eleven new permanent dwellings and included proposals for the environmental/ecological enhancement of the surrounding grounds and the re-instatement of the perimeter garden wall.

It was advised that a number of pre-application meetings and discussions had taken place with regard to the replacement of the existing chalets resulting in the submission of an application in the previous year for their replacement with eleven dwellings and including proposals for the environmental/ecological enhancement of the surrounding grounds (NP/11/276). This application was reported to the Development Management Committee on 24th August 2011. Officers recommended that the application be approved as it was considered that the proposal represented an appropriate design, scale and layout which would not cause any harm to the setting of the listed building over and above that which already existed through the presence of the eleven existing chalets to the immediate rear of the listed building and that the proposal complied with adopted planning policy. Members resolved to refuse the application as it was considered that the permanent structures would not enhance the natural beauty or cultural heritage of the Manor or its grounds, or the wider National Park landscape. In addition the layout and siting were considered to be alien to the surrounding quality of the natural and built environment and would reduce the special qualities of remoteness and tranquillity, the rich pattern and diversity of the landscape and the historic environment of Llwyngwair Manor. It was also considered that the proposal would detract from the setting of the listed building and would be out of character with the natural landform by virtue of its urban cul-de-sac highway layout with limited integrated landscaping and the retention of the plateaued area. As such it was felt that the proposal failed to comply with National and Local Planning Policy. Members also considered that the site had been let down by previous planning decisions and these should not influence a further inappropriate development on the site. The applicant had appealed the decision and a Hearing in respect of the appeal was scheduled to be heard on 24th July, 2012. Since the decision Cadw had stated that the development would have little impact on the



listed building itself as the Manor had many unsympathetic alterations over the years and the Walled Garden would be retained and improved. Since refusal of planning permission, discussions had taken place with regard to an alternative proposal.

The Case Officer believed that this application complied with adopted planning policy and was of an acceptable design and layout and did not affect the setting of the listed building or the amenity and character of the wider area. The proposal did not adversely affect protected species or trees and provided some enhancement for biodiversity and the local environment. It was felt that the site could also be adequately serviced by the infrastructure available and whilst the comments of the objectors were noted a number of the matters raised were not material planning considerations and the application was therefore recommended for approval.

Members were advised that since writing the report two further letters of objection had been received. Letters of support had also been received from the Highway Department of Pembrokeshire County Council and the Trunk Roads Agency. They were also advised that no requirement for affordable housing was to be provided.

Mr Andrew Rees addressed Committee. He stated that although the application involved the demolition of 11 chalets he believed the landowner only owned two of the chalets outright. He said that six of the chalets were currently occupied by local people but after development they would no longer be affordable for local use. He believed that if planning permission were granted and the previous appeal was also granted then the landowner would have two different options on the development and there would be no control over which option he would use. He believed that the proposed bungalows were overpowering due to the pitch of the roof and the block timber wall finish. He questioned the need for a gated complex. He also felt that there was a chance the development would take several years to develop and questioned what would happen to the site in the meantime. He also asked whether the landowner planned to tidy the rear of the Manor as it was currently very untidy.

Mr Irvine Johnston then addressed Committee in his capacity as agent to the applicant. He advised Members he had attended Committee when the previous application had been refused permission and was aware of the concerns of Members. He appreciated the sensitivity of the site and tried to address the issues raised previously. There were a number of constraints on site including some mature trees, a flood plain and the Manor House itself. He sought to answer some of the concerns of the previous speaker. He said that appropriate notice had been served on all



parties concerned however this was a civil matter and not a material planning consideration. He assured Members that work would be undertaken in a phased manner and they would seek to cause minimal disruption during works. In terms of the layout he confirmed that the landscape had been softened and they sought to provide better quality permanent units in the vernacular tradition. He assured Members that they had not sought to create a gated community but were trying to achieve a semi formal approach to the community given that the Manor was still a working business and they felt that some degree of separation was warranted. He informed Members that several bat surveys had been carried out and it was found that there was no bat activity in the chalets. He stated that this was a million pound development which he felt would benefit the surrounding area and the National Park itself.

Members felt that the applicant had taken into account their comments on the previous application. They welcomed the opportunity to reinstate the south and west walls of the garden however asked that this be done in consultation with the Building Conservation Officer of the National Park Authority.

Some Members had sympathy with the occupants who had used the chalets for several years and who may not be in a position to purchase the refurbished chalets, but the Head of Development Management reminded them that this was a civil matter and not a material planning consideration.

Members asked for clarification on the position should the appeal on the previous application (NP/11/276) be granted as this would leave the applicant with two valid permissions. The Head of Development Management confirmed that there would be two permissions and the applicant could choose which one to use but could not mix the two. They also sought clarification on whether, should they grant permission, it would prejudice the appeal before the Inspector. The Solicitor confirmed that in reality it would not prejudice the appeal as Members already had before them as a matter of public record a recommendation from Officers to grant permission.

Members asked about the glass house on site and officers informed them that there were no specific proposals but it was shown on the plans as remaining on site.

Members also enquired about the containers on site and were informed that no planning permission existed for these and the Enforcement Officer would look into the situation.



DECISION: That the application be recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions together with a condition to remove permitted development rights (satellite dishes etc.) and a condition that the details of the replacement wall are to be provided to the Building Conservation Officer in advance.

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/12/0225
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Hawkins
PROPOSAL: Erection of attached garden store
LOCATION: Cromlech House, Newport
- (e) REFERENCE: NP/12/240 (Listed Building Application)
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Hawkins
PROPOSAL: Erection of attached garden store
LOCATION: Cromlech House, Newport

This application was to be considered by the Development Management Committee as Newport Town Council had objected to the application and the recommendation was contrary to this view.

The Case Officer advised that this was a full planning application for the erection of a garden store to the rear of Cromlech House, Newport, a Grade II Listed Building. The proposed store was single storey with a pitched roof extending from the rear of the previously approved extension, on the north eastern elevation of the dwelling. The proposed materials include matching stonework (to the main dwelling) under a slate roof with fenestration comprising a sash window and conservation roof lights. The proposed garden store was considered to be of a modest scale and the design and choice of materials were considered to be compatible with the dwelling and the setting of the Listed Building. The relationship between the proposal and the nearest neighbouring property had been carefully reviewed and was considered to be acceptable. The application was recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

The Head of Development Management circulated a letter of objection received from Mr Phillips. The Monitoring Officer advised Members that this letter was written by Mr Phillips in a personal capacity and must be taken as Mr Phillips personal view even though it was also the view of the Newport Town Council.

Mr F C Ruel addressed Committee. His property was adjacent to Cromlech House and he objected to the development. He believed that the wall was too big and was too close to his conservatory. He disagreed with the statement in the report that his view would not significantly change as his bedroom and bathroom would now be 4 metres from a stone wall. He informed Members that there were currently bushes where



the stone wall was to be sited and in winter the bushes died back and allowed light into his property but this would not happen once the wall was built. He also did not believe the wall would blend in as it would be stone and the rest of the house was light blue.

Mr Irvine Johnston then addressed Committee in his capacity as agent to the applicant. He informed Members that Cromlech House was an impressive landmark building which had undergone an extensive period of refurbishment but was lacking outside storage space. They had considered alternative sites on the land but this was deemed to be an unobtrusive area. The site was on a lower ground level than the conservatory next door. He did not agree that the wall would block light from the next door conservatory as the roof of the conservatory was glass and would get sunlight most of the day. He believed they had attempted to provide a good element of mutual screening whilst trying to ensure that the light was not held back from the neighbouring property.

Members enquired as to whether the proposed building was connected to the main house and officers informed them that it was a standalone building but would have a walkway to the main house. Some Members felt that this would affect the neighbouring property and enquired if it could be sited elsewhere on the site but the Head of Development Management reminded them that they must decide on the application before them.

DECISION:

- 1. That the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions**
- 2. That Cadw be recommended to grant Listed Building Consent for planning application NP/12/240.**

[The Authority's Solicitor drew attention to the fact that the following applications were ones in which the Authority was the applicant. He 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.]

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/12/0232
APPLICANT: Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
PROPOSAL: Siting of a single mobile ice-cream van between 1st April and 31st October each year
LOCATION: Freshwater East Car Park, Freshwater East

This application was before Members as the application was made on behalf of the Authority.



Officers advised that Freshwater East Car Park site was located within the base of the valley and adjacent to the main Trewent Hill access road which lead to East Trewent. The current proposal sought permanent seasonal consent for the siting of a single mobile ice-cream van on an area of grass adjacent to the main car park between 1st April and 31st October each year.

Officers were of the opinion that the proposal could be supported subject to positive consultation response being received from the outstanding consultations. Any consent to be issued would be subject to conditions relating to the siting of the facility, the range of products sold and the provision of adequate measures to deal with potential litter problems.

Members were advised that the Environment Agency had since responded with no objections however the provider should be made aware that the site was within a flood zone.

Lamphey Community Council had also since responded with no objections.

DECISION:

That the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions including a condition on the management of litter

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/12/0233
APPLICANT: Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
PROPOSAL: Siting of a single mobile ice-cream van between 1st April and 31st October each year
LOCATION: St Govans Car Park, Castlemartin

This application was before Members as the application was made on behalf of the Authority.

St Govan's Car Park was located adjacent to St Govan's Head on an elevated area of coast line; the site was accessed from a single track road which ceased at the car park. The current proposal sought permanent seasonal consent for the siting of a single mobile ice-cream van to the North West corner of the existing grasscrete area adjacent to the main car park between 1st April and 31st October each year.

Officers were of the opinion that the proposal could be supported subject to positive consultation response being received from the outstanding consultations. Any consent to be issued would be subject to conditions relating to the siting of the facility, the range of products sold and the provision of adequate measures to deal with potential litter problems.



DECISION:

That the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions including a condition on the management of litter

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/12/0234
APPLICANT: Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
PROPOSAL: Siting of a mobile ice-cream van between 1st April and 31st October in each year
LOCATION: Stack Rocks Car Park, Ermigate Lane, Merrion

This application was before Members as the application was made on behalf of the Authority.

Officers advised that Stack Rocks Car Park was located adjacent to Elegug Stack and the Green Bridge location on an elevated area of coast line; the site was accessed from a single track road which ceased at the car park. The current proposal sought permanent seasonal consent for the siting of a single mobile ice-cream van to the south west of the existing grasscrete area adjacent to disabled parking bays between 1st April and 31st October each year.

Officers were of the opinion that the proposal could be supported subject to positive consultation response being received from the outstanding consultations. Any consent to be issued would be subject to conditions relating to the siting of the facility, the range of products sold and the provision of adequate measures to deal with potential litter problems.

DECISION:

That the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions including a condition on the management of litter

- (i) REFERENCE: NP/12/0235
APPLICANT: Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
PROPOSAL: Siting of a mobile ice-cream van between 1st April and 31st October each year
LOCATION: Manorbier Car Park, Manorbier, Tenby

This application was before Members as the application was made on behalf of the Authority.

Officers advised that Manorbier Car Park was within the base of the valley adjacent to Manorbier Castle and was located within the Conservation Area of Manorbier. The current proposal sought permanent seasonal consent for the siting of a single mobile ice-cream van within the main car park between 1st April and 31st October each year.



Officers were of the opinion that the proposal could be supported subject to positive consultation response being received from the outstanding consultations. Any consent to be issued would be subject to conditions relating to the siting of the facility, the range of products sold and the provision of adequate measures to deal with potential litter problems.

Members were advised that since the writing of the report Manorbier Community Council had written in support of the application but no response had been received from Cadw.

DECISION:

That the application be approved subject to appropriate conditions including a condition on the management of litter

- (j) REFERENCE: NP/12/0238
APPLICANT: Mr T Wood
PROPOSAL: Change to use of existing guest house to 2 holiday flats. The owners private accommodation to be located on the ground floor level. The existing side annex is to be extended to accommodate new entrance foyer on ground floor level and new ambulant disabled staircase to access first and second floor level
LOCATION: Clement Dale Guest House, South Cliff Gardens, Tenby

The Head of Development Management advised that this application had been withdrawn.

- (k) REFERENCE: NP/12/0258
APPLICANT: Ms N Harries
PROPOSAL: Reserved matters application for consideration of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and sale, for a 3-bed dwelling one and a half storey house
LOCATION: Land at Coedmore Field, Dinas Cross, Newport

Before considering this application Members were given a few moments to consider a booklet which was handed around on behalf of Harries Design & Management. This had been received by the Authority within the time limit for receipt of late correspondence and as such was allowed to be considered.

This application was to be considered by the Development Management Committee as Dinas Community Council had objected to the application and the recommendation was contrary to this view.



Officers advised that this was a reserved matters application proposing a three bedroomed detached dwelling at land adjacent to Coedmor, Dinas Cross. It was an outline approval for a single dwelling on the site, and the current reserved matter application sought approval of access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale.

The application proposed a large detached dwelling orientated gable-end on to the highway. Officers felt that the village of Dinas was characterised by properties facing the highway, either immediately adjacent to it or set back from it. They felt the proposal was at odds with the character of the village and as a result was recommended for refusal.

Officers also advised that the site had a number of constraints which led to the proposed dwelling being sited very close to the adjacent bungalow, Coedmor. The proximity was considered harmful to the amenity of the occupiers of this property and formed a further reason for refusal.

Members were advised that at the time of writing the report no comments had been received from the South Wales Trunk Road Agency as regards the impact of the proposal on the A478T and consequently Members were requested to delegate the refusal of the application to the Head of Development Management once the Agency had responded.

Mr R Harries, the Applicant, addressed Committee. He advised Members that he felt the property had been designed in a very traditional manner and in-keeping with the style of property already present in the area and taking into account a number of constraints on the site. The scheme was designed perpendicular to the main road in the style of what would have been present on the site historically. He believed this was in-keeping with the original grain of the village which had since been changed by a number of new houses in the area. He accepted that there could be some overshadowing of the neighbouring property and was prepared for the property to move a metre away from the boundary if that would help. He did not feel that the large size of the proposed property should be an issue as other properties in the area were on the same scale.

Some Members felt that the fact that the property was gable-end on to the highway should not be a major concern but felt that the property could possibly be positioned slightly differently on the plot of land taking into account the constraints on site of the water main together with the sewer and stream. The Head of Development Management advised Members that she would have reservations about making amendments to the application at this stage and they should consider only the application before them.



Members were concerned that the property would overlook the neighbouring property and although they were informed that Coedmor was in the same ownership as the development property they felt that this should not be a consideration as the situation could change in the future.

DECISION: That planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. Policy 1 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan requires that development within the National Park is compatible with the conservation or enhancement of the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the Park. Policies 8, 15, and 29 seek to protect the special qualities of the National Park and local distinctiveness, ensuring that the identity and character of towns and villages is not lost through (amongst other requirements), poor design and layout, and to not adversely affect the qualities and special character of the Park by losing or failing to introduce important traditional features. The proposal by reason of its orientation on the site (i.e. gable-end facing the highway), and its large size results in a incongruous addition to the street scene and the local distinctiveness of the village that is also harmful to the special qualities of the National Park, and therefore contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.**

- 2. Paragraph 9.3.3 of Planning Policy Wales states that new development should not be allowed to damage an area's character or amenity, including the serious loss of privacy or overshadowing. Policies 29 and 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan state that new development should have an integrated approach to design and construction, and be well designed in terms of neighbour amenity considerations, and not have an unacceptable impact on it. The proposal by reason of its size and proximity to the neighbouring residential property results in an unacceptable level of overshadowing that is considered harmful to the amenity of neighbouring property. The proposal is therefore contrary to Adopted Development Plan Policy.**

- (I) REFERENCE: NP/12/0314
APPLICANT: Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority
PROPOSAL: Improvement and reconfiguration of Solva Car Park and associated works, in addition to providing a single storey storage shed to be sited adjacent to existing toilet block.
LOCATION: Solva Car Park, Main Street, Solva

This application was before Members as the application was made on behalf of the Authority.



Officers advised that Solva Car Park was located within the base of the river valley and adjacent to the main A487 road leading to St Davids. The proposal sought to improve and reconfigure Solva Car Park and carry out associated works together with the provision of a single storey storage building which was to be sited adjacent to the existing toilet block. Officers were of the opinion that the current proposal offered a significant improvement in visual terms to the existing site which was also considered to have a positive visual impact on the Conservation Area. The proposal also reconfigured the site layout to provide a wider range of facilities without having an adverse impact on the current facilities provided, whilst the design and materials proposed were of a high quality with traditional detailing adopted for the replacement storage structure and associated car park equipment. They felt the current proposal could be supported subject to positive consultation responses being received from the outstanding consultations.

Officers advised that since writing the report they had received five letters of objection to the scheme. In addition a query had been received in relation to ownership of the land and the Estates Officer had confirmed that the National Park Authority holds the Title Deeds. The Environment Agency had asked for the surface run off to be sorted and Pembrokeshire County Council had confirmed that they had a right of way over the car park and had asked for slight amendments to spaces 69 to 78 to enable a wider aisle for them to use. The proposals were therefore recommended for approval subject to the changes requested by Pembrokeshire County Council.

It was also confirmed by officers that the remains of the Smalls Lighthouse were to be relocated before work commenced.

Mrs Jenny Davies addressed Members in her capacity as Chair of the Solva Community Council. She stated that the Community Council had worked with the National Park since 2009 when it had been decided to introduce charges to the car park in Solva as the Community Council had been led to believe that the sea was eroding the car park and it would cost a lot to put right. When the current plans were introduced there was no mention of subsidence. She asserted that she had evidence by virtue of conveyances and other legal documents that the National Park Authority did not have legal title to the land the subject of this application

The Solicitor to the Authority advised Members that the Authority's Title to the land was registered at the Land Registry. He advised that it was possible to challenge a registered title, but that strong, substantial evidence would need to be produced. He added that in any event the Committee's task that day was to decide the planning application on its



planning merits – whether any permission granted could be lawfully implemented was a separate issue.

Mrs Bella Prickett then addressed Committee as a representative of the Business Community of Solva. She believed that charging in the car park would be very bad for business and would deter people from stopping in Solva. She had hoped that the plans would be an improvement on the current arrangements but did not believe that they were. She believed that there should have been an increase in parking spaces available rather than a decrease. She stressed that the business owners did not want a pay and display machine and would prefer to keep the attendant.

Mr Andrew Muskett then addressed Committee as Agent for the applicant. He advised Members that the National Park Authority had commissioned a Government funded study to look at how car parks could be improved and enhanced. When the findings were evaluated Solva Car Park came high on the list for improvement. When grant funding became available the National Park was successful in obtaining a 50% grant for two projects – Solva and Porthgain – each with a value of £150,000. Three schemes had been considered for Solva and the 83 space scheme had been chosen on the grounds of health and safety on site. He advised that the anticipated start of the project would be mid September with completion by Christmas. The works would be done in phases to cause the minimum disruption to local businesses. Boats could be winter stored. He advised that the plans had been amended slightly to take into account the changes requested by Pembrokeshire County Council.

Mr Muskett then answered several question from Members including details regarding disabled spaces.

As Members had been given the opportunity to question Mr Muskett they were also given the opportunity to question the previous two speakers also but there were no questions.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to issue conditional permission on receipt of satisfactory consultation responses.

- (m) REFERENCE: NP/12/0075
APPLICANT: Mr K Beynon
PROPOSAL: Removal of occupancy condition no. 2 on TB/1707
LOCATION: Zion Gardens, St Johns Hill, Tenby

This report was before Members as the applicant had appealed to the Planning Inspectorate against the non-determination of the application by the Authority within the statutory period of 8 weeks.



Officers advised that the decision on the application now passed to the Planning Inspectorate although the Authority had to defend its appeal case by means of exchange of written statements. In this regard the Authority was seeking a view from Members as to whether planning permission would have been granted. Had the Authority been in a position to determine the application officers would have recommended refusal of the application on the grounds that the scheme would allow the erection of full residential units with no contribution to affordable housing and as such would be contrary to the aims of the Local Development Plan Policy 45. Officers also considered that the scheme would allow the erection of full residential units which would provide no private amenity space to serve future occupiers and a lack of outdoor storage space. As a result it was felt that the development would conflict with and be contrary to Policies 15 and 30 of the Local Development Plan.

In 1972 planning permission was granted for development of the application site and its adjoining land (to the west) for the erection of 26 holiday units, a private flat and detached house. The permission was part implemented in that the development to the west of the application site was completed although development was not carried out on the land subject of this application. A condition was attached to the planning permission restricting the use of the holiday units approved as holiday accommodation to not be used between the periods 1st March to 30th November and 14th December to 14th January.

In 1991 an application was submitted to remove a holiday letting condition attached to the main planning permission for the site (TB/1707). The application sought removal of the condition from 10 of the completed holiday lets to allow for full residential use in the west portion of the site. It did not include the land subject of this application and planning permission was approved subject to additional details being submitted in respect of any external changes and removal of permitted development rights of the residential units.

The Head of Development Management clarified that the planning permission granted in 1972 had only been partially built and was inappropriate for the present day. She advised Members that if built according to the 1970 permission there would be conditions imposed as to when the property could be inhabited and Members were being asked to remove this condition. Her advice was that the layout of the scheme for full residential use would be inappropriate. Secondly there would need to be some provision of affordable housing on a site in the centre of Tenby and there was no such offer. Thirdly infrastructure payments would need to be considered and these had not been offered. It was felt that there



were three strong reasons why, had the application come before Committee on that day, it would have been refused.

DECISION: To note the report and endorse the reasons given by Officers as to why planning permission should not be forthcoming for the proposal.

9. Appeals

The Head of Development Management reported on 10 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.

All queries raised by Members were answered by Officers.

NOTED.

10. Delegated applications/notifications

39 applications/notifications had been dealt with 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 39, it was reported that 10 applications had been refused, none cancelled and 2 withdrawn.

NOTED.

