

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

21 October 2020

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

Councillor P Baker, Mrs D Clements, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor M Evans, Councillor P Harries, Dr M Havard, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs J James, Councillor M James, Mr GA Jones, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor PJ Morgan, Councillor A Wilcox, Councillor M Williams and Councillor S Yelland

[Mrs S Hoss joined the meeting following consideration of the Solicitor's Report (Minute 6 refers)]

[Virtual Meeting, 10.00am – 11.45am; 11.55am – 13.40pm]

## 1. Congratulations

The Chair passed on the congratulations of the Authority to Councillor P Baker who had been awarded a British Empire Medal in the recent Queen's Birthday Honours List.

## 2. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Dr RM Plummer.

## 3. 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
Minutes 7(a) below NP/19/0522/FUL – Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier	Councillor M Evans	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed

## 4. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 2 September 2020 and 5 October 2020 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on the 2 September 2020 and 5 October 2020 be confirmed and authenticated.

**NOTED.**



## 5. 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 7<sup>th</sup> 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*):

<b>Reference number</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Speaker</b>
NP/19/0522/FUL <i>Minute 7(a) refers</i>	Outline planning permission for 14 affordable housing units. Full planning permission for the change of use of land from 85 tents & tourers to 85 static caravans with associated landscaping, distributor roads and new sewage pumping station – Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier	Mr Ray Hughes

## 6. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, and it had been updated as requested at the last meeting of the Committee to put at its heart the purposes and duty of the National Park. It went on to outline the purpose of the planning system and relevant considerations in decision making, the Authority's duty to carry out sustainable development, ecological considerations which included the role of the Environment Wales Act 2016, human rights considerations, the Authority's guidance to members on decision-making in committee and also set out some circumstances where costs might be awarded against the Authority on appeal.

Since the previous meeting of the Committee the Authority had adopted the Local Development Plan 2 and the report had also been updated to make reference to that document.

### **NOTED**

## 7. Report of Planning Applications

The Committee considered the detailed reports of the Development Management Team Leader, 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*):

*[Councillor M Evans disclosed a prejudicial interest in the following application and withdrew from the meeting. Councillor P Kidney advised the Committee that the speaker, Mr Ray Hughes, would be speaking from his house as he did not have access to a computer. The Solicitor confirmed that this was acceptable. Councillor S Yelland was not present when the vote was taken on the application.]*

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/19/0522/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr D Brown & ATEB  
PROPOSAL: Outline planning permission for 14 affordable housing units. Full planning permission for the change of use of land from 85 tents & tourers to 85 static caravans with associated landscaping, distributor roads and new sewage pumping station  
LOCATION: Buttyland Caravan & Camping Park, Manorbier, Tenby

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when it had been deferred to allow a site inspection, which had taken place on 5 October 2020 (*Minute 4 refers*). It was reported that since previous consideration of the application, Local Development Plan 2 (LDP2) had been adopted and the report before Members had been updated to reflect this.

It was noted that this was a hybrid application, that is one that sought outline planning permission for one part and full planning permission for another part of the same site. The application had been reported to the Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the views of the Community Council. The application was also classed as a major development and had received third party objections. The material objections received were summarised and addressed in the report before the Committee.

It was reported that the site was a long established caravan site located on the road running towards Manorbier Station. The site was no longer allocated for residential use in LDP2 and had been taken out of the Centre boundary for Manorbier Station. However Policy 7 set out the types of development that might be permitted in the countryside and this included the release of land adjoining centres for affordable housing to meet an identified local need. Policy 41 allowed for limited caravan, camping and chalet development, and it was considered that the application, with its much improved landscaping scheme, would achieve



an overall improvement from the current situation, with the layout helping to consolidate the overall appearance of the site.

It was reported that the proposal, including the improved landscaping and the removal of the two market dwellings from the site was considered to be compatible with the policies of LDP2. Delivery of affordable housing was a priority of the Authority and certainty of delivery would be assisted by means of a S106 Agreement to ensure early and appropriate transfer of the housing site to a housing association. The principle of development was therefore considered to be acceptable.

Turning to visual amenity and the special qualities of the National Park, Natural Resources Wales (NRW) had advised that the site was of high sensitivity, lying as it did within the National Park and comprising open fields and hedgerows, though with touring caravans and tents during the summer months. This would change to permanent housing and static caravans, roads and hard surfacing. It was considered that the impact on the site would be major / moderate adverse, reducing with time as landscape mitigation took effect.

The applicant had submitted an amended landscaping scheme in order to provide mitigation against the visual impact of the proposed 85 static caravans. While the site boundaries comprised hedgebanks with lots of trees which were mainly to be retained, many of the boundaries were thin with lots of gaps and provided very little screening in the winter months. Officers considered that the amended scheme provided sufficient landscaping to mitigate and enhance the existing visual situation.

It was reported at the meeting that NRW welcomed the revised landscape strategy, which was considered to fully address the previous concerns raised. They had advised that a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) for the site was also required to ensure the success of the proposed mitigation measures and this had now been submitted and circulated to consultees. As a result suggested conditions 2 and 10 would need to be amended to make reference to the document.

Notwithstanding the objections received, following consideration of the policies contained within LDP2 and National Planning Policy, the development was considered to be in keeping with their aims in that the development would conserve and enhance the existing character of the site and the special qualities of this area of the National Park. As such, and subject to a S106 Agreement to secure the transfer and delivery of the 14 affordable housing units and to revoke any other consents or lawful uses on this site, together with a schedule of suitable conditions to control the development, the application was considered to be acceptable and it



was recommended that it be delegated to officers to grant part outline and part full planning permission.

In response to questions from Members, the officer provided clarification on a number of points. They were advised that the open market housing had been removed from the application as a result of the land allocation being removed from LDP2 and the Plan could now only support an exceptional release of land for 100% affordable housing at this location. However the land on which the open market housing had been located remained as a green strip as part of the current application. The level of parking provided for the affordable homes met the requirements of ateb, who were joint applicants, and the Highway Authority.

With regard to the proposed replacement of the touring pitches with statics, a caravan and camping survey conducted to support LDP2 felt that there area had sufficient capacity to allow a changeover to statics. Control over the colour of the static caravans would be provided by condition 16, however the officer advised that this could be strengthened to ensure that it was maintained in perpetuity.

The landscaping plan aimed to reinforce the eastern boundary of the site in particular, and also to break up the visual impact of the caravans with interspersed planting. It proposed a mix of small and medium, in addition to larger specimen trees, which would provide shelter for the smaller trees. However various methods were proposed to control the maintenance of the landscaping for longer than the normal 5 year period and there would therefore be a mechanism to ensure that any trees lost, for example due to Ash Dieback, would be replaced.

The speaker, Mr Ray Hughes, then addressed the Committee. He advised that he was speaking as an individual rather than on behalf of the Community Council. He stated that applications on the site had received objections from both local residents and Manorbier Community Council and, as the applicant had ignored planning restrictions imposed on him previously, it had been necessary for the Authority to issue enforcement notices. Mr Hughes referred to a memo from Sarah Hirst to Andrew Richards dated 13/08/20 which set out the policy where proposals were seeking to amend the types of caravans on a site which stated that in certain circumstances the Authority had allowed a change to static caravans where number had been reduced. However he pointed out that the current application proposed no reduction in numbers at all and said that he believed as a rule of thumb 4 touring caravans should be replaced by 1 static caravan to reflect the amount of traffic generated. He believed there would be an impact on the landscape, particularly in views from the north. The site would be open for twelve months of the year which he feared would lead to people living in the caravans.



With regard to the provision of affordable housing, Mr Hughes noted that full planning permission had already been granted for 23 units on a site adjacent to Manorbier School and more on a site at Bush Terrace in Jameston.

His greatest concern related to the additional traffic - potentially an increase of 200 cars - that would access what was already a very busy road, used by lorries and other heavy traffic. Traffic humps and double yellow lines had recently been installed around the school as it was very dangerous for children to cross the road and more cars would lead to chaos at school times as there was already insufficient parking which would be worsened by a significant rise in pupil numbers. He feared that children's lives were being put at risk and advised that he spoke from experience as he had a grandchild at the school; he suggested that a car park should be considered as part of the S106 Agreement.

Some Members were concerned about the cumulative effect on the character and amenity of the area if all the sites with planning permission for housing were built. Also the lack of facilities and services at Manorbier station for those living in the proposed affordable housing which one Member believed was too densely packed. Officers replied that there was a need for affordable housing in the area – LDP2 identified this as 18 units per year which was in excess of the numbers proposed plus those already granted. The school had also been consulted and had advised that it had sufficient capacity.

Another Member expressed concern regarding the capacity of the road and the safety of those walking along it. He noted the objection of the Community Council, and other residents to the development, who felt that their views had not been taken into account, and proposed that the application be refused. This was seconded.

Other concerns related to the large number of static caravans proposed on the site, and the fact that there was to be no reduction in numbers of units, as well as the year round nature of the occupancy condition proposed for the site. Officers replied that LDP2 allowed for an extension of caravan and chalet sites where these were appropriate in the landscape and where there was overall environmental improvement. This could mean either a reduction in number or robust landscaping to separate the units, and the latter was the case with the current application. Year round occupancy would support the area's year round tourism offer, however the units could not be used as a primary residence. With regard to road safety, the Highway Authority had advised that there would be a reduction in traffic numbers overall, based on the number of movements from the tent and touring unit pitches. As such, the concerns



raised were not shared by the Highway Authority which had recommended conditional consent.

The Solicitor then reminded the Committee of the procedures which applied when Members took planning decisions contrary to officer recommendations. The Director of Planning and Park Direction confirmed that if Members were minded to refuse the application, she would invoke the cooling off period due to the affordable housing element, as such a decision would be a significant departure from local and national policy.

The Solicitor then asked Members for the planning grounds for taking such a decision and these were given as overdevelopment of the site, impact on local residents and highway safety.

**DECISION: That Members were minded to refuse the application.**

As the application was subject to the cooling off provisions, it would be re-considered at the next meeting of the Committee.

*[The Meeting was adjourned between 11.45am and 11.55am]*

*[Councillor S Yelland re-joined the meeting during consideration of the following application but abstained from voting.]*

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/19/0616/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Silvester  
PROPOSAL: Replacement dwelling and ancillary potting shed  
LOCATION: Porth Y Rhaw, 22 High Street, Solva

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when it had been deferred to allow a site inspection, which had taken place on 5 October 2020 (*Minute 4 refers*). The application was before the Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the views of the Community Council and at the request of the Chair through the extended delegation scheme.

The property in question formed part of a terrace of cottages which lay within the local centre of Solva and within the Conservation Area. The cottage was in existence by 1838 but was extensively altered during the late C20 such that very little of the historic form and character of the property remained apparent. An application for Conservation Area consent was also before the Committee for consideration (*Minute 7(c) refers*).



Following consideration of the policies contained within Local Development Plan 2 and National Planning Policy and having regard to all material consideration, officers considered that the development offered an opportunity to demolish the existing dwelling and provide a replacement with a sustainable design that provided modern living accommodation. The development would conserve and enhance the existing character of the site and the special qualities of this area of the National Park. As such, and subject to a schedule of suitable conditions to control the development, the recommendation was one of approval.

Although they appreciated the concerns of neighbours with regard to overshadowing and overlooking, Members were satisfied that there would be no significant increase from the existing situation.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with approved plans and documents, parking, surface water drainage, protection of public sewer, ecology, photographic survey of existing building prior to demolition, fenestration and the potting shed not to be used for overnight accommodation.**

*[Councillor A Wilcox tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture.]*

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/19/0617/CAC  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Silvester  
PROPOSAL: Replacement dwelling and ancillary potting shed  
LOCATION: Porth Y Rhaw, 22 High Street, Solva

It was reported that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when it had been deferred to allow a site inspection, which had taken place on 5 October 2020 (*Minute 4 refers*). The application was before the Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the views of the Community Council.

The property in question formed part of a terrace of cottages which lay within the local centre of Solva and within the Conservation Area. The cottage was in existence by 1838 but was extensively altered during the late C20 such that very little of the historic form and character of the property remained apparent.

This was an application for conservation area consent for the demolition of an existing dwelling in order to allow a proposal for a replacement dwelling and ancillary potting shed granted under NP/19/0616 (*Minute 7(b) refers*). Such consent was required for the demolition of a building over 115 cubic metres. Officers considered that the proposed demolition





would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area in the wider context of the proposed development and was considered acceptable, subject to conditions.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to the timing of development, accordance with approved plans and documents, demolition works not to take place more than 3 months before the commencement of building works and be carried out in accordance with the Construction Method Statement.**

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/20/0150/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Callaghan  
PROPOSAL: Reserved Matters application following  
NP/18/0342/OUT for a single dwelling  
LOCATION: Penfeidr Uchaf, Newport, Pembrokeshire

It was reported that outline consent had been approved in 2018 for a single dwelling on this site. A binding Unilateral Undertaking in respect of an affordable housing payment had been submitted at that time which agreed the principle of a commuted sum based on floorspace of the dwelling to be approved at a later stage.

The current application sought reserved matters approval for all matters – access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. The proposed design featured a traditionally designed stone fronted main house oriented to the north/north-west with an attached higher-level section in a more contemporary form.

Since writing the report, the officer reported that a landscaping scheme had been submitted and approved by the Authority's Tree and Landscape Officer, however the suggested conditions to control both exterior lighting and to impose a physical boundary to the buffer zone remained relevant.

It was concluded that the principle of a dwelling on this site had been accepted through the granting of outline consent. The subsequent matters were considered to be acceptable and not cause harm to the special qualities of the National Park. The application was therefore recommended for approval subject to conditions.

The application was reported to the Committee as Newport Town Council had recommended refusal and the reasons for this were sought. Officers advised that while they had considered the design of the main house to be acceptable, they considered that the 'extension' was large, obtrusive and out of keeping. Also the glass-faced elevation facing the road was inappropriate.



Referring to the comments of the Town Council, one Member noted that there was much concern around Newport regarding what was becoming a pattern of development for large glass-fronted buildings of innovative design, with views of the sea or mountain, and that these were altering the look of the National Park in this area. Members too expressed concern regarding the elevated position of the contemporary element of the build and its glass-fronted façade which was considered to be visually intrusive and lead to significant light spillage. It was also suggested that the development had an unacceptable adverse effect on the landscape and was contrary to policies 9, 14 and 30 of LDP2. They considered that if the application were to be approved, conditions should be imposed to control both the level of the building relative to the surrounding land and lighting.

Other Members agreed that buildings today were used differently to those designed in the past, particularly in relation to aspect and fenestration, and were concerned that cumulatively there could be an impact on the character of the community. They asked whether conditions could be imposed to reduce the level of the contemporary element of the building and a reduction in the amount of glass.

The officer replied that the roof had been designed with an overhang which would act as a hood to control light spill and a condition to control external lighting could be extended to include internal lighting. While a condition to control levels could also be included, these could not be reduced as much as she believed Members would like as it was a fundamental part of the design that the contemporary element of the build was accessed from the first floor of the main dwelling.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to allow the officer to discuss submission of a revised plan to drop the level of the contemporary element. An amendment was then proposed and seconded that the application be refused.

The vote on the motion to refuse the application was won so that it became the substantive motion, and a vote on this motion was also won.

#### **DECISION:**

**That the application be refused for the following reason:**

- 1) The amount of glazing, combined with the level/height of the contemporary element of the proposal and the potential for light pollution, was felt to be out of character with the surroundings. This is contrary to the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan 2 (adopted September 2020) Policies 8, 9, 14 & 30.**



[Councillor M Evans tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture.]

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/20/0325/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Cooksley  
PROPOSAL: Alterations and extension to existing property including drainage and landscaping works.  
Demolition of existing garage and erection of a replacement garage  
LOCATION: Rhigian, Dinas Cross, Newport

It was reported that the application was referred to the Committee at the request of the Chair of the Development Management Committee through the extended delegation scheme process.

The application proposed to re-model the existing dwelling by extending to two storey where the footprint was currently single storey, and to echo and extend the roof shape to twin gable with a glazed and raised roof over the original stone face of the cottage. The design retained some traditional elements and incorporated a strong element of contemporary architecture.

While Newport Town Council had expressed a number of concerns over the design of the proposed dwelling, having viewed the site from both the coastal path and within the site itself, the officer did not agree that the proposals would cause either significant visual detriment due to height, or light pollution. The report concluded that the proposed extensions and alterations were considered to comply with all relevant local and national policies and the application was recommended for approval subject to conditions.

It was noted at the meeting that one late representation had been received objecting to the application due to its size and contemporary design.

Highlighting again the concerns of Newport Town Council in respect of light spillage from the glazed gable and visual intrusion due to the increased height of the property, one Member agreed that the proposed development was incompatible with its surroundings and would cause significant light pollution from several vantage points including the beach. He requested that the ridge height of the property be carefully monitored if permission was granted. The officer advised that there was a considerable overhang on the glazed gable which would mitigate light spillage. She also did not believe that the dwelling would be visible from Newport beach.



**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of development, accordance with approved plans and documents, landscaping scheme, external finishes, removal of permitted development rights and lighting.**

