

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

15th April 2015

Present: Mrs G Hayward (Chair)

Mr A Archer, Mr D Ellis, Ms C Gwyther, Councillor P Harries, Councillor S Hudson, Councillor M James, Councillor O James, Councillor L Jenkins, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor RM Lewis, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Councillor D Rees, Mr AE Sangster, Councillor A Wilcox and Councillor M Williams.

[Llanion Park, Pembroke Dock 10.00am – 12.00pm]

1. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Mrs M Thomas.

2. Disclosures of interest

There were no disclosures of interest.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 4th March 2015 were presented for confirmation and signature.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 4th March 2015 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. In accordance with the decision of the National Park Authority of 7th December 2011, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak (*the interested parties are listed below against their respective application(s), and in the order in which they addressed the Committee*):

Reference number	Proposal	Speaker
NP/14/0681 <i>Minute 7(b) refers</i>	Proposed residential development of six dwellings and four affordable housing apartments. Access road, public footpath link and landscaping – land off Walton Road, Broad Haven	Mr A Vaughan Harries, Agent



NP/14/0713 <i>Minute 7(c)</i> <i>refers</i>	Change of use to provide 17 static pitches, 16 touring pitches & 10 tent pitches (total 43) to replace 20 touring pitches & 30 tent pitches (total 50). Upgrading of the landscaping with additional screening within the park & improving the site entrance to highway requirement with additional site south boundary screening to the highway. Re-locate camping tents, trailer tents & camper vans behind new hedgebank in an area 19.8% of two front fields for full seasonal use. Removal by Section 106 Agreement the 28 day permitted development rights from remaining areas (80.2%) of two front fields – Whitewell Caravan Park, Penally	Mr Dudley Joseph, Supporter Mr Ken Morgan, Agent
NP/15/0010 <i>Minute 7(d)</i> <i>refers</i>	Retention of an existing works shelter, tool store and parking area ancillary to land management and horticulture activities and restoration of biodiversity – Allt Tabor, Dinas Cross	Mr John Howells, Supporter

5. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system and stated that planning decisions had to be made in accordance with statutory provisions and the adopted Local Development Plan unless material considerations indicated otherwise. It stressed that non-material considerations had to be disregarded when taking planning decisions and stated that personal circumstances were only very rarely material to planning decisions. Provided Members applied the Planning Acts lawfully and in a fair and impartial manner they would also comply with the Authority's duties under the Human Rights Act 1998 insofar as it applies to planning decisions. It was also important that Members applied the guidance contained in the Authority's Planning Code of Good Practice while carrying out their statutory duties, which supplemented the statutory Members Code of Conduct.



NOTED

6. Report of Planning Applications

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/14/0637
APPLICANT: Mr W Staniland
PROPOSAL: Diversification of Brumwells Garden Machinery with the provision of 12 sustainable camping pods with car parking on adjacent land and link the existing dwelling of Badgers Holt as a live-work dwelling for the two businesses
LOCATION: Brumwell Garden Machinery, Badgers Holt, Jameston

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when it was subject to a cooling off period as Members were minded to approve the application subject to conditions and the decision would be contrary to policy.

Since the March Committee, officers had been in discussions with Pembrokeshire County Council's Access Officer who had confirmed that one unit should be suitable for users with disabilities, and that the existing units as designed were not currently suitable in size or layout.

The applicant had also recognised this issue and had provided drawings which indicated a slightly larger unit that catered for users with disabilities. The applicants had confirmed that the disabled unit would be sited to replace the proposed unit closest to the existing access/car park. The Access Officer had been consulted on the further amended drawings and was satisfied. The applicant had also produced a pollution prevention management plan and Natural Resources Wales had responded to say that this was acceptable.

Nevertheless, officers considered that while there was some sympathy with the applicant's difficulties with his existing business and some weight could be afforded to the material considerations mentioned in previous reports, these along with the additional drawings did not outweigh the overall purposes of the National Park, the need to protect its special qualities and the clear policy presumption against this form of development in this location. As such the application should be refused due to its non-compliance with the development plan and material considerations not outweighing the same. The reasons for refusal were



outlined in the report, however the officer suggested that for clarity the third reason should be split into two parts resulting in four reasons.

It was noted that as the scheme had been submitted as a diversification and that the existing house would be linked to the two businesses, there was a need for a section 106 legal agreement to ensure that the business elements and the residential accommodation on site were bound together and secured within this application. The Solicitor drew Members' attention to a letter which had been circulated to the Committee which set out the willingness of the applicant to complete a Section 106 legal agreement and therefore this reason for refusal would be resolved by delegation to officers should members be voting to grant approval.

A number of Members again expressed the view that they were still of the opinion that the application should be approved for the reasons set out at the previous meeting – that the development was modest; the site fell within the curtilage of the dwelling and could not be considered to be in the open countryside; approval of the application would support the existing businesses as it was a diversification and other local facilities such as the shop, post office and public house, particularly outside of the summer season; the 'wigwam' lodges were novel and exciting and would improve the quality and range of tourist accommodation; the site was well screened and not highly visible; and there were no objections to the development from the public or Community Council. The fact that the applicant had gone to the trouble and expense of providing accommodation for disabled visitors added to this support. A motion of approval, subject to conditions and completion of a S106 Agreement, was proposed and seconded.

Other Members, however stated that there was no doubt that the application was contrary to the development plan, and despite having sympathy with the applicants, they did not feel that the material considerations were sufficient to outweigh the policy objections.

Before voting on the motion of approval, the officer was asked to give guidance on conditions that could be imposed. He suggested that the application should be subject to a S106 agreement which should be submitted within 3 months or at the discretion of the Chief Executive, Director of Park Direction or Head of Development Management, and that any permission should therefore be delegated subject to conditions relating to time limit, accordance with plans, provision of further drawings regarding the disabled unit, which should be constructed in the first phase, no pods to be located within 3m of the hedge, parking and turning, foul and surface water, holiday occupancy and lighting. The proposer and seconder agreed to amend the proposal to one of delegation subject to



the legal agreement and conditions outlined, and a recorded vote was then taken. The result was as follows:

For: Ms C Gwyther, Councillor ST Hudson, Councillor M James, Councillor R Kilmister, Councillor P Morgan, Councillor R Owens, Councillor D Rees, Mr T Sangster and Councillor T Wilcox.

Against: Mr A Archer, Mr D Ellis, Councillor P Harries, Mrs G Hayward, Councillor O James and Councillor M Williams.

Abstention: Councillor L Jenkins and Councillor RM Lewis.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive (National Park Officer)/Director of Park Direction and Planning/ Head of Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 Agreement to link Badgers Holt to the two businesses and conditions relating to time limit, accordance with plans, provision of further drawings regarding the disabled unit, which should be constructed in the first phase, no pods to be located within 3m of the hedge, parking and turning, foul and surface water, holiday occupancy and lighting.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/14/0681
APPLICANT: Mr M Llewellyn
PROPOSAL: Proposed residential development of six dwellings and four affordable housing apartments. Access road, public footpath link and landscaping
LOCATION: Land off Walton Road, Broad Haven

The application was reported to the Committee due to it being for a Major Development as stipulated in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (Wales) Order 2012.

The application proposed, in outline, the erection of six dwellings and four affordable housing apartments including a new access road, public footpath link and landscaping. The submitted application form indicated that all matters were reserved for future approval, although illustrative plans showing how the site could be developed had been submitted.

The plan indicated a layout comprising six detached 3/5 bed roomed dwellings and four 2 bedroom apartments arranged around a new estate road with turning facilities provided off Walton Road. The proposed dwellings along the northern side of the estate road would be split level and cut into the shallow gradient of the field.

Following consideration of the policies within the Local Development Plan, officers considered that the principle of development of this site for housing purposes to be acceptable, given that the site was a housing allocation. The increase in the number of units from 8 to 10 was



acceptable having regard to the fact that the increase was to provide for additional affordable housing to meet an identified need. Subject to detailed scrutiny of the access, layout, appearance, scale and landscaping at Reserved Matters stage, and subject to the developer entering into a Section 106 Agreement to commit to the provision of affordable housing on site and a planning obligation to provide for highway improvements the application was acceptable and was recommended for approval.

A number of letters expressing concern at the development had been received and the points raised were summarised in the report before the Committee.

There was one speaker, the agent, Mr Andrew Vaughan Harries. He said that both he and the applicant were pleased with the recommendation of approval but noted that he had been engaged on the scheme two years previously which demonstrated how complicated the planning process had become. He welcomed the flexibility in the type of affordable housing provided in the scheme.

Consideration had been given to the objections submitted and he assured the Committee that neighbour amenity would be respected when the Reserved Matters application was submitted. The applicant was also happy to take on board any conditions imposed and had said that he wanted to enhance this part of the National Park.

Members were pleased to see an allocated site coming forward and were also pleased at the numbers of affordable units proposed. As this was an outline application, they were happy that the detailed concerns of neighbouring properties would be addressed in a Reserved Matters application. It was, however, suggested that a requirement for details of hard or soft screening to protect the amenity of neighbours could be included as a condition on the current application.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive (National Park Officer)/Director of Park Direction and Planning/ Head of Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the interested person(s) first entering into a satisfactory Section 106 Legal Agreement or Agreements to include the following necessary planning obligations: procure that 40% of the dwellings built on the site are thereafter maintained as affordable housing units in perpetuity; pay a contribution of £2500 per dwelling for highway works and improvements along Walton Road and Marine Drive. The permission also to be subject to conditions relating to the timing of the submission of reserved matters application; such a submission to be in accordance with indicative plans and approved



in writing before any development begins; reserved matters submission to include details of topography and cross sections, a comprehensive tree and landscaping scheme to include screening, highways, parking and turning, details of footpath, foul and surface water disposal scheme, sustainable drainage and biodiversity enhancement measures.

[Councillor R Owens was not present when the following application was considered]

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/14/0713
APPLICANT: Mr D Mitchell
PROPOSAL: Change of use to provide 17 static pitches, 16 touring pitches & 10 tent pitches (total 43) to replace 20 touring pitches & 30 tent pitches (total 50). Upgrading of the landscaping with additional screening within the park & improving the site entrance to highway requirements with addition site south boundary screening to the highway. Re-locate camping tents, trailer tents & camper vans behind a new hedge bank in an area 19.8% of the two front fields for full seasonal use. Removal by Section 106 Agreement of the 28 day permitted development rights from remaining areas (80.2%) of two front fields
LOCATION: Whitewell Caravan Park, Penally, Tenby

It was reported that following the service of an Enforcement Notice in March 2014, this application had been submitted in order that a solution to the issue might be reached. It sought planning permission for a change of use on site to provide 17 static pitches, 16 touring pitches and 10 pitches to replace 20 touring pitches and 30 tent pitches. The application included landscaping improvements, highway entrance modifications as well as removal of 28 day camping rights from the front two fields.

Following a consideration of the planning merits of the scheme, it was considered that the development did not comply with the terms of Policies 38, 39 or 41 of the Local Development Plan in that additional holiday accommodation units were proposed and the site area enlarged. However the application did include a package of visual improvements that needed to be considered in the wider balance of material considerations. In this instance the application would result in substantial landscaping improvements across the site which would improve the existing appearance of the application site when viewed from land to the North. Furthermore the removal of permitted development rights on part of the site would improve the appearance of the site from the road frontage. As a result the scheme was considered to be acceptable subject to the



improvements being secured through appropriate planning condition, notwithstanding the lack of compliance with development plan policies. As such the application was recommended for approval.

The first of two speakers on this application was Mr Dudley Joseph whose family were neighbours to the site and he expressed his support for the application. Mr Joseph explained that he worked from home in employment that required concentration and that he had experienced disruption and loss of amenity due to unlicensed camping taking place in the 28 day fields; this had led to him moving out of his home for short periods over the summer months. In neighbouring a caravan site, he acknowledged that he expected some disruption, however he had objected to the manner in which the applicant had sought to increase the intensity, which had led to an unbalanced situation; a recent permission for development of stables into a parking and reception area had increased the level of noise. His property was surrounded on three sides by the caravan park, and he hoped that the current application would remedy matters and lead to a tolerable level of disruption. He believed that the application offered a balance which would allow the business to grow, enhance the area through landscaping and improve his amenity. Key to this was the removal of permitted camping rights from the agricultural fields, and this needed to be applied immediately, as enforcement had not been effective in controlling their use under the 28 day rule. He pointed out that the creation of access tracks in the main application field meant that this land was now incapable of supporting 30 tents and therefore displacement of these would continue to occur this summer unless progress was made.

The second speaker was Mr Ken Morgan, the architect for the applicant. He was pleased to hear Mr Joseph's support for the application, as neighbours normally objected. He acknowledged that his client had stretched the rules, however he was not alone in having done this. He stated that they were committed to addressing issues raised by neighbours and also environmental concerns, at the same time as trying to improve the caravan park. Progressive standards in caravanning meant that there was a need to improve buildings as well as provide more touring pitches, rather than camping and he noted that the standards of caravan were far superior to those originally situated there. This application sought to regularise the situation, following the enforcement action, with his client having been involved in tough negotiations over the previous 12 months. He believed that the resulting application would improve the environment of the caravan park and make it more enjoyable for tourists as well as the wider environment. It would also result in a more sustainable business. This was a good compromise that would hopefully satisfy all parties. He hoped Members would approve the



recommendation and expressed his client's willingness to comply with the conditions.

Officers explained that whilst initially it had been thought that a S106 Agreement would provide the best solution to remove development from the front two fields, further consideration had concluded that the same outcome could be achieved through a condition to remove the permitted development rights which currently allowed camping in them. Members wished to ensure that this provision was enforceable and also questioned the timeframe for implementation of this condition. The Head of Development Management replied that the condition was enforceable once the planning permission had been implemented, ie once works commenced on site and this was confirmed by the Solicitor. However the Authority still had the ability to continue the enforcement action through to prosecution if the permission was not implemented, and the site would be monitored closely over the coming season.

Members were pleased that agreement had been reached between officers and the applicant and agreed that there were clear planning gains in the current application, critically through the provision of landscaping, and they stressed the importance of the conditions being enforced, particularly regarding camping in the front two fields. The recommendation of approval was therefore moved and seconded.

Some concern was expressed regarding the proliferation and quality of roadside signage at the site and officers replied that this did not currently form part of the application but could be regulated under advertisement regulations. An amendment to the resolution to approve the application was then proposed which included an additional condition on signage, however this vote was not carried. A vote was then taken on the substantive motion that the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and this was carried.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of development, development in accordance with plans, details of the numbers and positions of the static caravans, touring caravans and unit pitches permitted, occupation for holiday purposes only, siting of touring caravans, tents, trailer tents and camper vans during the period 1 March to 1 October, amended landscaping scheme, agreed colours of the static caravans, details of the 'Bod Pave' to be approved, removal of permitted development rights to prevent camping in the two southern fields and surfacing of the access road.



- (d) REFERENCE: NP/15/0010/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr J Spikes
PROPOSAL: Retention of an existing works shelter, tool store and parking area ancillary to land management and horticulture activities and restoration of biodiversity at Allt Tabor
LOCATION: Allt Tabor, Dinas Cross, Newport

Planning permission was sought retrospectively for the retention of a temporary work shelter and tool store, which was constructed in 2013 for use by the applicant whilst undertaking the management and restoration of a 12 acre hillside site. In addition it was proposed to complete an area of hardstanding and parking by infilling a sloping section of land with a mixture of stone and soil to make a low key parking and turning area. Retrospective planning permission had originally been sought in 2014 for the development, but was refused on the grounds that the work shelter had not been justified for agricultural purposes within the open countryside. The land was not associated with a dwelling nor as part of a farm and it fell outside of the Rural Centre boundary defined for Dinas Cross in the Local Development Plan.

Following consultation on the proposal, Dinas Cross Community Council had advised that it objected. One letter of support had been received from a neighbour.

The planning application referred to land management that did not fall within the maintenance of a residential curtilage, an allotment space, nor was land in use as an existing agricultural business. Nevertheless, the evidence provided illustrated that the area of land had benefitted from low-impact management and enhancement. The terrain of the land was rugged and the extent of the land area was significant. While the management of the land was clearly a lifestyle choice by the applicant, officers considered that it was undertaken using sustainable, low impact principles; it would not therefore be unreasonable for a shelter/tool store to be provided given the terrain and limited vehicular access to the site. The building itself was not considered to be a prominent addition or feature in the landscape and did not cause visual intrusion in the wider countryside setting.

Following consideration of the policy context and having regard to all material considerations, it was considered that the development was acceptable for the purposes of the management of this land. However given the nature of the management and the structure, officers would recommend a temporary planning permission of 5 years to allow the Authority to monitor the land management of the site, and to decide after



the expiry of the temporary consent whether there was sufficient justification to grant a permanent permission.

There was one speaker on this application, Mr John Howells, a neighbour. He spoke in support of the development and said that many in the community shared his view, rather than that of the Community Council, and were impressed by the report on the nature of the environment. He admitted that when Mr Spikes, the applicant, had introduced himself Mr Howells had felt some apprehension at his alternative lifestyle, however he had watched with interest what was happening on the land and had discovered that his worries were unnecessary as Mr Spikes was an enthusiast for conservation and was found to be knowledgeable and hard working. The track through the site was used by dog walkers, however the hut itself was not visible from the road, although the car park was a little more conspicuous, and the land was managed with minimal intervention from machinery. He asked the Committee to approve the application as the land was too steep for sheep grazing and it would therefore revert to the wilderness that it had been previously.

Explaining the views of the Community Council, one of the Members said that concern had been expressed as Mr Spikes had been living in the shelter. Light had been seen coming from there at night and a large number of unsightly water containers had been stored on the verge by the parking area. While he acknowledged that improvements had been made to the land management of the site, and that it was important that parking was available off the well-used track that ran through the site, he wished to ensure that the building could not be used for residential use. He also asked that the water containers be controlled in some way.

Officers replied that conditions had been suggested which attempted to limit the use of property and if it were used in ways that did not accord with the conditions, enforcement officers would follow it up. They also agreed to investigate the siting of water containers on the site.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions requiring the site to be restored on or before expiry of 5 years and the building not to be occupied as a main/sole residence.



- (e) REFERENCE: NP/15/0054/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr T Melia
PROPOSAL: Single storey extension to the east elevation of Apartment 9
LOCATION: Apartment 9, Waters Edge, Battery Road, The Burrows, Tenby

Members were reminded that planning permission had been granted in 2008 for a development of 19 holiday apartments overlooking South Beach in Tenby. The holiday occupancy condition had been removed in 2009 to allow the apartments to be for full residential use. Apartment 9 was situated on the third floor of the front part of Waters Edge development, and the proposal was for a minor extension to the eastern side of the apartment to enclose a small section of the existing external balcony/front terrace.

At the time of writing the report, the public consultation process was still underway, however it was reported at the meeting that no objections had been received from third parties at the close of the period. Tenby Town Council had, however, recommended refusal as it considered that the proposal would fundamentally change the original integral and aesthetic design of the building.

Taking account of policies in the Local Development Plan and the concern of Tenby Town Council, officers considered that the scale of the extension was minor, and would only have a limited impact on the overall massing and appearance of the apartment block. The extension would still sit beneath the main roof overhang, and as it would be using external finishes to match the existing building, was not considered to fundamentally change the overall character. As such officers recommended that the application could be supported subject to standard conditions relating to time and accordance with plans.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to time and accordance with plans.

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/15/0061/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr D Williams
PROPOSAL: Construction of shower/changing block
LOCATION: Atlantic View, Settlands Hill, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest

Planning permission was sought for the erection of a shower/changing block at the existing caravan site to the south of Atlantic View Guest House. The caravan site was a certified site with the Caravan Club which allowed for up to five caravans at any one time, reserved exclusively for



Caravan Club members. It was located in an elevated position on the southern outskirts of Broad Haven. The proposed shower/changing block, which replaced a previous shower block on site, would be sited within the eastern area of the building curtilage, running parallel with the existing building. It would be of a utilitarian design with rendered walls and interlocking tiled roof. Solar panels for heating the water within the building would be installed on the western roof, and an oil tank compound would be installed on the southern end of the building.

The Havens Community Council and one neighbouring property had objected to the application due to the scale of the building, particularly its height and that it would be visually intrusive. As a result the height of the proposed building had been reduced by 0.4m.

Officers considered that the proposed building would be situated in the least prominent area of the site, adjacent to the main building, and would benefit from the existing screening afforded by the lowered land levels and existing mature planting. The proposed building would be read within the context of the existing extensive building and would be seen as a small addition to the site, given its modest scale in comparison with the main building. Therefore the proposed development was not considered to have an adverse impact on the amenity or the special qualities of this area of the National Park and complied with policy of the Local Development Plan.

The application site fell within the defined Development High Coal Risk Area and Coal Authority records indicated that within the application site and surrounding area there were coal mining features and hazards which needed to be considered. As a result a Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report was requested and submitted, however the Coal Authority had advised that it still objected to the application and requested a revised Coal Mining Risk Assessment Report which was still awaited. The application was therefore recommended to be delegated for approval subject to a positive recommendation received from the Coal Authority and appropriate conditions.

One Member felt that the proposed shower/changing block would be obtrusive in what was a prominent site and that it would have been better located to the rear of the dwelling. The height of the building was also questioned, and officers replied that it could not be reduced further due to the height required for the disabled ramp. Others were happy to support officers considering that the building would be viewed alongside the house and would be screened to a degree by landscaping.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to the Chief Executive (National Park Officer)/Director of Park Direction and Planning/ Head



of Development Management to grant planning permission subject to the recommendation received from the Coal Authority, and appropriate conditions.

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/15/0085/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr P Prosser
PROPOSAL: Change of use of fort & island to visitor attraction uses, including C1, D1 and D2 with gift, food & drink & retail uses A1 and A3. Restore/replace railings, install 2 cranes, 2 boat landings, construct security residence use C3, construct toilet & pumping facilities, install cliff nature walk, signage, path lighting, operations lighting, replace fort entrance bridge, install services, repair stairs & install new, install CCTV
LOCATION: St Catherines Island, Castle Beach, Tenby

It was reported that this application was a resubmission of a proposal for works comprising the restoration and conversion of the fort, the provision of new buildings to provide supporting facilities/services, and the improvement of access to and on St Catherines Island to create a family visitor attraction. The original application had been refused by the Development Management Committee in July 2013. A subsequent appeal made to the Planning Inspectorate was dismissed on the sole ground that the Inspector, while satisfied that there was sufficient evidence to indicate that there was on-going use of the fort by bats, considered it was insufficient to establish the extent of or to assess the impact of the project on that use. The resubmitted planning application was therefore as originally presented but with the addition of a new protected species survey and comments on this were awaited from Natural Resources Wales (NRW).

It was reported at the meeting that although some comments had been provided by NRW, a comprehensive response had not yet been received. A response was also still awaited from Cadw. It was therefore recommended that the application be deferred to allow proper consideration of the issues. The solicitor clarified that whilst that had been an accurate statement, NRW had responded that morning. The latest NRW response recommended that protected species issues be considered by the County ecologist.

It was also reported to the meeting that a response from CADW was awaited.

As a result, officers did not consider that there was sufficient information to enable the application to be considered, and that deferment would be appropriate to enable the NRW response to be clarified and CADW to respond.



Members were extremely disappointed at the lack of information from the statutory consultees, particularly the response from NRW which had only been received ten minutes before the meeting. They asked that the Chairman of the Committee write to the Minister for Natural Resources, under whose remit NRW fell, to say that the delay in replying was unacceptable and had put the Authority in a difficult position as a decision on the application could not now be taken and this had an economic impact.

DECISION: That the application be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee.

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/15/0121/NMA
APPLICANT: Mr A Muskett
PROPOSAL: Non-material amendment to NP/*12/0527 for additional signage to car park exit – erect 2 ‘No Entry’ signs either side of car park exit
LOCATION: Poppit Sands Car Park, Poppit Sands, St Dogmaels

This application was being reported to the Development Management Committee for consideration as the applicant and landowner was the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Authority.

The application sought non-material amendment following the grant of planning permission under reference NP/12/0527 for the proposed improvement and reconfiguration of the existing car park at Poppit Sands. On implementation of the works, it was identified that additional signage in the form of two ‘No Entry’ signs either side of the car park’s exit was also required, however these signs did not form part of the planning permission. Therefore this application sought non-material amendment for the addition of two ‘No Entry’ signs at the car park’s exit.

Officers considered that the addition of two ‘No Entry’ signs at the exit of the car park, by reason of their scale and nature would not result in a development which was substantially different from the originally approved scheme, and as such could be considered as a non-material amendment to the previously approved planning permission.

It was reported at the meeting that no adverse comments had been received from the Highway Authority, therefore the recommendation was one of approval in accordance with submitted plans.

Members agreed that this was a safety issue that needed to be addressed. They asked about the height of the signs and were advised that this was a parameter set by the Highway Engineer.



DECISION: That the application be approved in accordance with submitted plans.

9. Appeals

The Head of Development Management reported on 3 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. The appeal decision for 4 Residential Units at 46 High Street, Tenby, which had been allowed, was appended to the report.

NOTED.

