

# Development Management Committee

21 July 2021

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

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

[Virtual Meeting: 10.00am – 11.00am; 11.05am – 1.50pm; 2.20pm – 3.30pm]

## 1. Apologies

There were no apologies for absence.

## 2. Disclosures of interest

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

<b>Application and Reference</b>	<b>Member(s)/Officer(s)</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
<i>Minute 6(b) below</i> NP/20/0397/FUL - Side/Rear Extensions, 3 No. Dormer Windows to Front, 1 No. Rooflight to Rear - Accommodation to be used for Domestic Purposes Ancillary to the Main Dwellinghouse only, 2 Vanderfoof Way, Saundersfoot	Councillor P Baker	Personal declaration so remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting thereon
<i>Minute 6(c)below</i> NP/21/0015/FUL - Change of 6 touring caravans to 6 static caravans, associated external works including ecological and landscaping enhancements, Wynd Hill, Manorbier	Councillor M Evans	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed



<i>Minute 6(e) below</i> NP/21/0110/FUL – Replacement dwelling, Pencastell, Moylegrove	Councillor M James	Personal declaration so remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting thereon
<i>Minute 6(f) below</i> NP/21/0149/FUL Change of use of land to create seasonal camping facility (7 no. tents & siting of welfare facility structure) – Speedlands Farm, Dale	Councillor M Evans	Personal declaration so remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting thereon
<i>Minute 7(a) below</i> EC/16/0044 Medical Hall, Tudor Square, Tenby	Councillor M Evans	Personal declaration so remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion and voting thereon

### 3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 9 June 2021, 16 June 2021 and 21 June 2021 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 9 June 2021, 16 June 2021 and 21 June 2021 be confirmed and authenticated.

**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 7<sup>th</sup> December 2011, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak. It was also noted that the Authority, at its meeting on 16 June 2021 had resolved to allow an individual who had addressed the Committee on a particular application at a previous meeting to be permitted to address the Committee again if the application was deferred for any reason to subsequent meetings, for a maximum of three minutes, provided only new material was to be presented (*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/21/0215/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Proposed conversion and extension of the existing barn into a three bedroom dwelling. Removal of the existing residential static caravan. Relocation of existing hay barn and replacement with a stable. – Bower Farm, Broad Haven	Ruth Birt-Llewellyn - Applicant
NP/21/0102/FUL <i>Minute 6(d) refers</i>	Demolition of existing residential dwelling house and garage. Construction of new residential dwelling house and garage. – Ringstone, Haroldstone Hill, Broad Haven	Cllr Gill Collins – Havens Community Council Theresa Bowen - Applicant Mr Andrew Gardner – objector on behalf of elderly parents
NP/21/0110/FUL <i>Minute 6(e) refers</i>	Replacement Dwelling – Pen-castell, Moylegrove	Mr Richard George - Objector Hedydd Lloyd – Community Council Andrew Hebard – Applicant
NP/21/0149/FUL <i>Minute 6(f) Refers</i>	Change of use of land to create seasonal camping facility (7 no. tents & siting of welfare facility structure) – Speedlands Farm, Dale	Lyn Jones – Community Council Claire Williams - Applicant

## 5. Members' Duties in Determining Applications

The Solicitor's report summarised the role of the Committee within the planning system, with particular focus on 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.

In response to a question regarding the impact on the Authority of stricter targets for phosphate levels on the Cleddau River Special Area of Conservation, the Director of Planning and Park Direction advised that currently no planning applications were affected.

## NOTED

### 6. 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*):

[The Chair advised that he had altered the running order of the Committee that morning to allow the final application to be considered first]

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/21/0215/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms R Birt-Llewellyn  
PROPOSAL: Proposed conversion and extension of the existing barn into a three bedroom dwelling. Removal of the existing residential static caravan. Relocation of existing hay barn and replacement with a stable  
LOCATION: Bower Farm, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3TY

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 to take place.

The application sought to convert and extend the existing stone barn with a first floor pitched roof extension. An earlier application in 2020 had been withdrawn as it could not be supported on design grounds, and while the current application had revised the roof shape, the scale of the conversion had not been reduced.

The site was outside of any centre defined in Local Development Plan 2 and while conversion of the building was permitted under Policies 7 and 48 subject to payment of a commuted sum (a unilateral agreement had



been received in this regard), replacement of the barn structure with a new build dwelling would not be supported.

Officers considered that the design of the current scheme was not sensitive or sympathetic to the traditional building being converted and did not conserve or enhance the special qualities of the National Park. It could not therefore be supported and the recommendation was one of refusal.

There was one speaker, Ruth Birt-Llewellyn who, having spoken at the previous meeting, was entitled to speak for 3 minutes only, in accordance with the resolution of the National Park Authority on 16 June 2021. She thanked the Chair for moving her application to the beginning of the meeting and Members for their attendance at the site visit. She stated that she believed the application was in accordance with policies 1, 8, 14 and 21a of the Local Development Plan 2 and that overall the setting would be enhanced. She noted that the proposed dwelling would not be visible from outside the site and the footprint of development would decrease due to the removal of the caravan; the height would be lower than that of both the existing hay barn and the main farmhouse. She advised that the current design was her own, to live in for the next 50 years, however if a flat roof was preferred, that was an option, having formed part of the original design. She didn't want to convert the barn into a 2 bed cottage that was suitable only as a holiday home; it had been gifted to her so she could live there and this would enable her to care for her parents – the proposals included a disabled access and a chair lift. Ms Birt-Llewellyn explained that even though she worked full time for Pembrokeshire's fastest growing company, she would struggle to buy a house in Pembrokeshire where she had been brought up. Noting that Pembrokeshire has the highest number of second homes in Wales, she read a quote by the Minister for Climate Change which expressed the desire that people were enabled to stay and thrive in their own communities which would become sustainable in the longer term. She suggested to the Committee that they had a choice to either help local people live and stay in Pembrokeshire, or to allow second home buyers to price them out – this would lead to a year round economy or one that was only seasonal.

While Members had a lot of sympathy with the applicant, refusal of the application was moved and seconded. They hoped that, through ongoing dialogue with officers, a solution could be found to retain the barn and allow a dwelling that was suitable for the applicant's needs. The Director of Planning and Park Direction advised that the Authority had approved many barn conversions with lightweight extensions and officers were happy to advise on designs that were acceptable in the National Park.



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

- 1) The proposed conversion and extension of the existing building is not considered to represent a sympathetic conversion of a traditional building, and to be both overdevelopment of the existing building and to represent a poor quality of design. It is therefore contrary to Policies 1, 7, 8, 14 & 29 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan.**

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/20/0397/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr G Thomas  
PROPOSAL: Side/Rear Extensions, 3 No. Dormer Windows to Front,  
1 No. Rooflight to Rear - Accommodation to be used  
for Domestic Purposes Ancillary to the Main  
Dwellinghouse only  
LOCATION: 2, Vanderhoof Way, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire,  
SA69 9LH

It was reported that the application was referred to the Committee as the officer's recommendation of approval differed from the Community Council's request for refusal, and at the request of the Chair through the extended delegation scheme.

The site lay in an established residential estate within the Saundersfoot centre boundary. The application proposed extension of the existing garage to the rear with a pitched roof extension over, creating a secondary entrance point to the property, together with the addition of dormer windows and a rooflight. The extension would provide a photography studio (for domestic purposes only) and study, with additional living accommodation in the roof space.

The proposed alterations and extensions were considered to be acceptable in principle, being contained within the established residential curtilage and being of similar appearance and form to the host dwelling, using external materials and finishes to match the existing dwelling. A suitably worded condition would be imposed to ensure that a separate unit of accommodation was not created, and that the property was not used for commercial purposes. The design was considered to be appropriate and compatible with its context, surrounds and character and appearance of the existing host property and the street scene.

Objections had been received in respect of amenity and privacy of neighbouring properties and parking, as set out in the report, however subject to the imposition of suitable worded conditions relating to rear windows being of obscured glazing and non-opening, the scheme was not considered to cause an adverse impact on the privacy and amenity of



neighbouring properties to an unacceptable degree. With regard to parking, the Highway Authority had advised that insufficient information had been provided in respect of adequate off-road parking provision at the site to serve the increase in bedrooms proposed. Officers noted that the existing landscaping to the front of the property formed an attractive part of the streetscene and its loss would be regrettable. Therefore a suitably worded condition would be added to any permission to require that details of adequate off-road parking provision at the site, and treatment of the existing front garden, vegetation/landscape features and boundary treatment to the frontage be submitted to and agreed by the Authority and Highway Authority prior to commencement of the of any works on site.

Officers concluded that the proposed scheme by virtue of its scale, form, appearance and declared use was considered to be acceptable in the context of the host property, streetscene and wider landscape subject to conditions as set out in the report. The proposal was not considered to adversely affect the special qualities of the National Park in the location and was not unacceptable development within the context of the residential setting. The recommendation was one of approval subject to conditions.

In response to the objections, the officer noted at the meeting that a dormer window had been added to another property on the estate and that there were outbuildings in the rear gardens of other properties. The Solicitor pointed out that the existing elevations only had been circulated to Members, however the proposed elevations had been shown as part of the officer's presentation.

Some Members expressed concern regarding loss of the front garden of the property to parking, potential overdevelopment of the site, overlooking from the front elevation and potential use of the property for commercial purposes. The officer replied that the proposed conditions 7 and 11 would require details of treatment of existing vegetation landscape features to be submitted and also that all surface treatments to be laid to permeable or semi-permeable materials only, while condition 4 would not allow the property to be used for any purpose other than as ancillary domestic accommodation. She noted that the highway separated properties at the front, however overdevelopment was a question for Members' judgement. Another Member noted that multi-use accommodation had become necessary to allow people to work from home. The recommendation of approval was moved and seconded.

**DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relating to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, external materials and finishes, use as domestic accommodation ancillary to the dwelling and not for commercial**



**purposes, rear glazing to be obscured and non-opening, details of off-street parking provision, biodiversity enhancement, external illumination, surface water drainage and permeable or semi-permeable surface treatments.**

*[The Committee was adjourned between 11.00am and 11.05am]*

- (c) REFERENCE: NP/21/0015/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr R Jones  
PROPOSAL: Change of 6 touring caravans to 6 static caravans, associated external works including ecological and landscaping enhancements  
LOCATION: Wynd Hill, Manorbier, Pembrokeshire, SA70 7SL

Before the officer could present the application, one Member said that he understood a letter had been received from a speaker that morning which suggested that he had been prevented from addressing the Committee and that he had been treated unfairly. He proposed that consideration of the application be deferred. Although other Members were not aware of the contents of the letter, the motion was seconded.

The Solicitor initially advised that he would be concerned if someone had been prevented from speaking, however on hearing clarification from the Deputy Monitoring Officer that the speaker had not been prevented from speaking and that arrangements had been suggested which would have allowed him to participate, he advised that he was happy for consideration of the application to proceed. Nevertheless, a vote was taken on whether to defer the application and this was won.

**DECISION: That the application be deferred.**

- (d) REFERENCE: NP/21/0102/FUL  
APPLICANT: Ms T Bowen  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing residential dwelling house and garage. Construction of new residential dwelling house and garage  
LOCATION: Ringstone, Haroldstone Hill, Broad Haven, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3JP

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 to take place.

It was reported that the existing dwelling was a 4 bed dormer bungalow built in 1974 that had been substantially extended and modified since its





original construction. It was immediately adjacent to a set of four linked dwellings to the west.

The replacement dwelling was proposed as a six bedroom house and it deliberately echoed the style of the original 1970s bungalow but with large sections of flat roof and only a small pitched roof area. In this respect, the design did not comply with Policy 29 of LDP2 which required local distinctiveness and place to be taken into account. Given the immediate setting of traditionally scaled pitched roof dwellings surrounding the property, the proposal was considered to be out of character with its surroundings. It was also likely to have a dominating impact on the adjacent complex of linked buildings as well as on Upper Lodge, a nearby characterful and important historic building which positively contributed to the landscape of the National Park.

It was reported that since the site visit, a further set of amended plans, adding a first-floor rear gable in order to address some of the privacy issues, had been received. These had been the subject of a re-consultation exercise, and it was reported at the meeting that there had been no change to the recommendations of Cadw and the Highway Authority, however the Community Council now advised that they objected due to the impact of the proposals on the skyline and the effect on privacy. As a result of the amended plans, officers had removed the reason for refusal relating to amenity, however that of visual impact remained.

The Solicitor pointed out that Members would have received a number of pieces of correspondence in respect of this application, however that from Mr Gardner expressed the view that the report did not accurately represent the views of the Community Council.

There were three speakers on this application. The first of these, Mr Andrew Gardner experienced some technical difficulties, and therefore the other two speakers spoke before him.

Gill Collins addressed the Committee on behalf of The Havens Community Council. She explained that it had reconsidered its earlier support following receipt of several concerns from residents in the community. She stated that people had been unaware that an application had been submitted as there was no site notice displayed. Having considered the concerns, the Community Council agreed that the design was likely to cause harm to the privacy and amenity of the adjoining property, and didn't complement the local environment or enhance the National Park. They did not believe there had been any consideration of the scale or design of the neighbouring properties and the proposals would dominate to their detriment. The property was in clear view of the



village and was not in keeping environmentally or with the aesthetic character of the village and would alter its appearance. There was also a danger that an approval could lead to further applications that did not blend in, which would be detrimental to the village and the National Park. While they agreed the current property was dated, they believed this was a missed opportunity to enhance the area. In respect of the amended plans, the Community Council believed that despite the lower height, the proposals still impacted on the neighbouring properties, and the glazing was out of character and had an impact on the skyline. Ms Collins hoped that the Committee would consider the Community Council's concerns and refuse the application.

The second speaker was Theresa Bowen, the applicant. She insisted that the notices had been displayed, except briefly when they had been brought down in a storm. She thanked the officer for agreeing that the gabled design had addressed privacy concerns in their entirety, noting that the nearest window was 48ft away and didn't overlook neighbouring properties. Ms Bowen believed that the design was in accordance with policy and did not cause harm, and noted that the buildings in the village and on the hill were a mixture of traditional and modern styles. She believed the proposed property would sit well in the landscape and would not dominate views from the beach, with other properties being more prominent, and that the Authority had a subjective view of design which wasn't a valid reason to refuse the application. It was acknowledged that the current house was of low architectural merit and she believed that the proposals would improve on the existing and enhance the landscape. Turning to the objections, she did not believe that the objectors could see that existing issues were addressed by the proposed design, and that the flat roofed area provided open space to mitigate overcrowding and encroachment. The boundary would also be set free. It was also noted that the ridge was only 500mm above the existing, and the only external lighting would be by the door for safety reasons. The design would also remove the need for fossil fuels. The applicant concluded by saying that the existing property had been her home for 22 years and she was passionate about achieving an acceptable solution.

Mr Gardner then addressed the Committee, objecting to the application on behalf of his elderly parents. They considered themselves fortunate to live in such a beautiful part of Pembrokeshire and had seen a lot of change in the National Park over the years, however they acknowledged that change was inevitable and their neighbour had every right to undertake work to her property. However Broad Haven was an area of outstanding natural beauty which required that special care be taken, as the replacement dwelling would be in place for many years. Mr Gardner agreed that the proposals were detrimental to the special qualities of the National Park. Haroldston Hill was an historic part of Broad haven and he



did not believe that a 2 storey property would harmonise with the picturesque landscape. The current property was large, and the proposed design was for an even larger property and, as the officer had stated, this would have a dominant impact on the adjacent buildings, of which his parents' house was the closest of a tightly clustered group, and their amenity would be adversely affected. He referred to Policy 30 of the Local Development Plan which related to Amenity and the adverse effect of overcrowding. In addition there would be an impact on the light and comfort experienced by at his parents' property. Mr Gardner acknowledged that there had been modifications to reduce the impact on privacy, nevertheless their concerns regarding privacy and amenity remained. The potential for the flat roof to be used as a terrace remained unresolved, as even if it were conditioned there were concerns as to how enforceable such a condition would be. He noted that the proposed remedies to privacy, to add a gable and a pitch to the garage, had added to the problems of crowding and loss of light. He lamented that the applicant had not sought pre-application advice on what was a large site. He concluded by saying that his parents had fallen in love with the National Park in the 1940s and had supported the Authority's efforts to preserve and enhance the Park. He hoped that the application would be turned down and that his family's rights to privacy and amenity would be protected and that they could continue to experience the peaceful enjoyment of their home.

A number of Members noted that they were not against contemporary design, however they did have concerns about the overbearing nature of the proposals and their impact on neighbouring properties. The Director of Planning and Park Direction noted that a pre-application had been submitted in 2019 for a different design to that currently proposed, however she believed that a solution could be found and officers would welcome ongoing discussions with the applicant and her agent.

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

- 1) The proposed design is not considered to respect the context, scale or design of adjoining development and will cause harm to the special qualities of the National Park. As such the proposal is contrary to TAN 12 (Design), Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, February 2021), and Policies 8, 14, 29 & 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan (adopted 2020).**



*[The following item was Chaired by the Deputy Chair]*

- (e) REFERENCE: NP/21/0110/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Andrew Hebard  
PROPOSAL: Replacement Dwelling  
LOCATION: Pen-castell, Moylegrove, Pembrokeshire, SA43 3BU

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 to take place.

It was reported that the existing 3 bedroom dwelling lay above Ceibwr beach on the cliffs to the north west of Moylegrove. The coastal path ran alongside the property and the site was in an exceedingly prominent location in the National Park. Historically, the property was believed to have been four agricultural workers dwellings, however it had been over extended and modernised in recent years.

The application had been significantly revised since its first submission, and now proposed a replacement dwelling with three bedrooms at ground floor level and a further two bedrooms at first floor level. The roof would be arranged in three different forms, the highest two storey section with zinc cladding, a lower slate roof and then a flat grassed roof with a buttressed chimney.

Officers considered that the scale and design proposed did not accord with Authority's policies and the proposed replacement dwelling failed to enhance the natural landscape and was likely to cause significant visual intrusion. The recommendation was one of refusal.

At the meeting, the Director of Planning and Park Direction clarified that the footprint of the dwelling would be wider and higher through the provision of an additional storey, although similar in length. Given the difficult access, any removal of the building would be subject to a Construction Management Plan.

Mr Richard George was the first of three speakers on this application. He advised that his family had lived at the nearby Tre-Rhys Farm since 1940 and noted that the weather there could be challenging. However at Pen-castell it was frightening, and he had in the past be asked to place shutters on the windows as an annual task, in order to protect them from the boulders that would blow over from the nearby cliff. In terms of accessibility, the site was approximately 1.5 miles from the main road, a quarter of a mile of which was bridleway and the remainder tarmacked by his father in the 1970s and since adopted by the Highway Authority. There were no laybys and few gateways. This road served a number of



properties, including a number of holiday cottages and a campsite, and Mr George was concerned that if a six bed property was permitted it would become dangerous, particularly as there had been no concrete information on whether it was to be a family home or let out. Mr George went on to paint a picture of the iconic view that could be seen from the nearby fields, consisting of a patchwork quilt of houses and small holdings whose basic structure had been unchanged for decades; he described it as stunning and unique, and suggested that to build a two storey building a few yards from the cliff edge was environmental vandalism, and the design, with large windows facing out to sea, was naïve. He noted that two television programmes had recently illustrated the unique location, describing the unspoilt nature of Ceibwr, outstanding geology and variety of sea birds in the area, with Pen-Castell hardly noticeable in the footage. He concluded by saying that local people had difficulty in obtaining permission for simple plans and feared that it would send the wrong message if permission was granted for this applicant from America. He hoped Members would put the wishes of local people and visitors to the area first.

The second speaker was Hedydd Lloyd, speaking on behalf of Nevern Community Council. She explained that they had discussed the application at their April and May meetings and had unanimously rejected the proposals to demolish Pen-Castell and rebuild as a modern house. She said that Moylegrove residents were very proud of the coast as it was very beautiful, with fantastic geological rock formations, and used to promote the National Park. Noting that the existing building had been described as of low architectural merit, she believed that a low key, insignificant dwelling was appropriate at this cliff top location, so that visitors walking the coast path could admire the view, rather than an architecturally designed eco dwelling.

Referring to the revised plans, which reduced the ridge height of the proposals, included a shallower pitch and changed the materials to minimise visibility, Ms Lloyd considered this to be an acknowledgement that the building needed to be low key. She advised that she had asked an architect to superimpose the latest proposals on a drawing of the existing dwelling and, showing this to the Committee, she said that it would be approximately one third bigger and higher; the footprint of the new building would also be closer to the cliff edge. She noted that the existing building followed the slope of the land, having been erected in a natural hollow to afford it some shelter, whereas properties today were built to enjoy the view. It was acknowledged that it would be a challenge to modernise and enhance the original stone building, which had already been extended a number of times, however reference was made to an article on the website of the Royal Institute of British Architecture which questioned the rebuild, rather than the reuse, of buildings for reasons of



sustainability and carbon footprint and this was something the Authority should take into consideration. Concluding, Ms Lloyd hoped that Pen-Castell would be brought back as a traditional Pembrokeshire Cottage, in keeping with area, but asked that any changes should not lead to an increase in height. She said she had been approached by several residents who were dismayed by the proposals for demolition and rebuild, and strongly objected. Allowing this to happen would be a huge shame, and an embarrassment to the National Park. She asked the Committee to keep Ceibwr unspoilt by modern development.

The final speaker was Mr Andrew Hebard, the applicant. He thanked the previous speakers and said he had found their presentations helpful and would share the insightful learning with his architects. He went on to provide some background to himself and the application, understanding that it was a hugely sensitive issue. He explained that he had lived in the United States for 20 years and wanted to move to Wales. His family were outdoor people, whose careers and passions were in gardening, farming and conservation, and having visited Pen-Castell they considered it to be very special and believed it should have a residence befitting of that special position. He explained that in commissioning his architect he had emphasised the need to balance the needs of ecology, sustainability, aesthetics and family accommodation and he believed this had been achieved, with one example being the living roof, and that following the first round of feedback, the changes made had still met those criteria. He believed the present plan complemented the location and was respectful, at one with, and part of, the environment. He explained that it would be a family home, with children, grandchildren and friends coming to stay and share in the special location and appreciate the area, and this formed part of the rationale for the design. He noted that he had received positive feedback from many in the community. He hoped that what was proposed was better than the current dwelling, and still met his criteria, and he asked the Committee to give his proposals a favourable opinion.

One Member asked Mr Hebard that, given his interest in ecology, whether his architect had undertaken any assessment of the carbon balance between restoration and new build. He replied that it had been discussed, however the balance between renovation and ongoing repairs was a difficult one. He had tried to use materials that were least impactful and given that his life had been dedicated to the health and wellness of the planet, it was not something that he had taken lightly.

Thanking all the speakers for their views, Members considered that the design was not appropriate for its location and the recommendation of refusal was proposed and seconded. Nevertheless they believed that an appropriate solution could be found and hoped that officers would work with the applicant to achieve this, for the benefit of the community and



National Park.

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

- 1) The development is located in a prominent and sensitive location, the proposal is considered to be of an inappropriate design, visually inconsistent and lacking any traditional or vernacular design features. It will cause harm to the special qualities of the National Park, contrary to Policies 1, 8, 14, 29 and 30 of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan.**

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/21/0149/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Reynolds & family  
PROPOSAL: Change of use of land to create seasonal camping facility (7 no. tents & siting of welfare facility structure)  
LOCATION: Speedlands Farm, Dale, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3QX

It was reported that this site lay adjacent to a row of 6 semi-detached dwellings and 700m to the north of the development boundary for Dale. Since its original submission, the application had been amended to alter the location of the tents and the facility building so that these now fell outside of the C2 flood zone, however the recreation area remained within the coastal change zone and flood zone. Prior to the meeting, the officer had circulated a replacement plan to Members of the Committee showing the relocated development which superseded that included with the report.

As a large proportion of the site was within a coastal risk management area (as defined in LDP2) and a C2 flood zone, it was noted that there was a fundamental policy objection to the development. Caravan parks were listed as examples of highly vulnerable development which local and national policies directed away from areas at risk of flooding. In addition, the site was within a registered historic landscape, close to a Site of Special Scientific Interest and close to the coastal edge and it was therefore in a highly sensitive location. Further, a study undertaken in 2015 looking at the capacity of the National Park to absorb additional camping and caravanning development had advised that there was no further capacity for development on the coastal edge or the valley between St Brides and Dale. Development of this site for the proposed use would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and special qualities of the National Park.

Objections had also been received from residents of the adjacent Jubilee Villas relating to the impact of noise and disturbance from occupants of



the campsite. Officers clarified at the meeting that several of these objections had been withdrawn, on the basis that concerns could be mitigated and managed by conditions, however there was one objection outstanding.

As a result of the fundamental policy objection to development in this location partially within the C2 flood zone, within a coastal risk management area and contrary to policies 41, 8, 14 and 30 of the Local Development Plan, the recommendation was one of refusal.

The first of two speakers was Lyn Jones, speaking on behalf of Dale Community Council, which had considered and supported the application. It had considered that the site was located in a secluded area, not visible from any direction, and that the community needed tourist accommodation as, apart from second homes, there was hardly any other accommodation and the development would therefore help local businesses. With regard to the flooding, Mr Jones said that he had lived in Jubilee Villas for most of his life and he noted that the bottom of the field flooded during heavy rain as the watercourse was not cleaned out. He said that if the site flooded due to tidal inundation the county would be in serious trouble. He also advised that the remaining objection was by an owner who had a holiday let, as the other three residents of Jubilee Villas did not have an objection.

Claire Williams then addressed the Committee on behalf of her parents at Speedlands Farm. She explained that they wanted to create a small, family friendly glamping site so people could enjoy the fantastic location that Speedlands enjoyed, providing a base for people to explore Dale and the surrounding area on an affordable basis. The tents, which would accommodate 5 people as a maximum, so the site would hold a maximum of 35 people at once, were also different, and she believed that is why they had received the backing of so many people. Ms Williams noted that thanks to the rise in staycations Dale, with its Watersports Centre, was busier than ever, however the limited amount of accommodation was booked up months in advance, with prices at a premium. Her parents wanted to provide something that was affordable. She explained that the tents would be erected from Easter until October, when the toilet and shower block would be stored in a shed and the field turned over for sheep to graze. She noted that Speedlands had been the family home for 5 generations and they wanted it to remain looking like it did currently. However at only 25 acres, the farm was not enough to make a living and it was necessary to diversify. The family wanted to better itself and create a better future for the families and they were passionate that it could be a success and would also create jobs for other people, such as cleaners, as well as local businesses. Noting that at the time the report had been written, there were two objectors, Ms Williams





advised that she had spoken to both of them; one had withdrawn his objection and the other had also said that he would. The family were happy to work to address noise concerns and would stipulate that the outside area should not be used after 10pm if necessary. In terms of the flood risk, she noted that the field had never flooded, beyond a little bit of water in the bottom on occasion. However they wouldn't want to put anyone at risk and they had therefore moved the tents higher up the field. Concluding, she said that Speedlands was their home and they wanted the development to be sympathetic and small.

In answer to Members questions, Ms Williams confirmed that no other fields on the farm were suitable, this being the flattest and most hidden. She went on to advise that although the plans suggested that the tents could accommodate 8 people, they wanted to create a family based glamping site, with each tent containing a double bed with pull out single beds, which would mean that it would not be possible to get 8 beds in. Each tent would have a small area outside for a barbeque and a basic toilet and shower block would be provided. There was already electricity to the field, so providing electric hook-ups would be easily achieved and there would be proper waste management. The Development Management Team Leader advised that Welsh Water had confirmed they had no objection to mains drainage.

Although Members agreed that advice about the flood risk had to be taken seriously, particularly in light of the recent flooding in Germany, of places that had not previously flooded, there was strong support for the development given the paucity of accommodation in the area, the low impact nature of the proposals and the support by the Community Council. It was noted that any consent granted by the Authority could be subject to conditions, which was not the case with certificated sites, an alternative route which could be taken by the applicants. It was considered that the flood risk could be managed by the applicants who lived close to the site and that the proposals were an example of a sustainable business. Approval of the development was therefore moved and seconded.

The Director of Planning and Park Direction advised that given the development was contrary to a strategic policy of the Local Development Plan and also to TAN 15, she would be invoking the Authority's Cooling-off period. The Solicitor advised that before any vote was taken, planning grounds for taking the decision had to be established. If these were accepted by the Director, and the vote was won, the application would be re-considered at the next meeting of the Committee. The ground for approving the application given by the proposer was the economic value to the area and the Director advised that this was a material planning reason.



Members asked that officers provide a suitable list of conditions, to include the need for an emergency plan to ensure appropriate consideration of what would happen to the site under flood conditions, amenity considerations and occupancy of the units.

**DECISION: That the Committee is minded to approve the application subject to conditions.**

**[As the cooling off period had been invoked, the application would be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee when it would be reconsidered.]**

[The meeting was adjourned between 1.50pm and 2.20pm]

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/20/0155/FUL  
APPLICANT: Mr Bowie, Humbergrange Ltd  
PROPOSAL: Proposed demolition of buildings and redevelopment to provide 14 no. dwellings, landscaping, access and associated works  
LOCATION: Rochgate Motel, Roch, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6AF

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda at this meeting.

**NOTED.**

- (h) REFERENCE: NP/21/0174/FUL  
APPLICANT: Dr T Hardman  
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing farmhouse and construction of replacement farmhouse  
LOCATION: Porthclais, St. Davids, Pembrokeshire, SA62 6RR

It was reported that Porthclais Farm was located in open countryside about 1km south west of St Davids, and comprised a traditional farmhouse with a range of old and modern outbuildings, together with an established caravan/tent site in the surrounding fields. The dwelling had been unsympathetically extended over the years and was in need of modernisation and repair. Planning permission had previously been approved for alteration and extension of the dwelling, however this had now lapsed.

The application proposed the demolition of the existing 6-bedroom stone dwelling and its replacement with a 4 bedroom dwelling with stone cladding.



Officers considered that while the dwelling had been significantly over-extended in an unsympathetic manner in the past, there was an opportunity to replace it either with something of good quality contemporary design, or with a design which echoed the character of a traditional Pembrokeshire farmhouse. The design proposed here was not considered to either conserve or enhance the special qualities of the landscape of the National Park, and could not be supported.

Members agreed that, while they were open minded to innovative and sympathetic buildings and new designs, the character of the particular area of the National Park needed to be taken into account to ensure that development sat well in the landscape and enhanced the area. It was hoped that more sympathetic proposal could be considered by the Committee in future.

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

- 1) **The proposed design, proportions and stone cladding are considered to have a harmful impact on the special qualities of the National park as they pay little regard to the traditional vernacular style, the overall design and detail comprising neither good modern sustainable design or careful facsimile and the proposal is therefore considered contrary to Policies 1, 8(d), 14 (a,c,d,) and 29 (a) of the Pembrokeshire Coast National Park Local Development Plan, the principles of TAN12 and Planning Policy Wales (Edition 11, February 2021).**

## **7. Enforcement**

### **a) EC/16/0044 – Medical Hall, Tudor Square, Tenby**

Members were reminded that authorisation to instruct Solicitors to commence prosecution proceedings in respect of unauthorised works to this listed building had been granted by the Committee in October 2018. The Authority was currently undertaking court proceedings and it had been brought to officers' attention by the defendant's Counsel that there was an error in the date when the Authority had become aware of any issue as provided in the October 2018 Committee report.

Officers acknowledged the concern raised by the defendant in terms of correcting a minor date error within the original report and wished to seek formal remediation of such. This was within the legal context that there were no time limits within which a listed building enforcement notice had to be issued and that the focus of enforcement action was the building, and not the perpetrators of unauthorised works. The Committee was therefore asked that officers be authorised to use the report before them



as an addendum to the original report of 17 October 2018, clarifying the narrative in terms of when issues of unauthorised works arose.

One Member questioned why details of the ongoing court proceedings had not been supplied, providing the Committee with a more balanced picture on which to take a decision, and whether proceeding with the action was proportionate and cost effective. He believed that doing so could make the building not fit for purpose and jeopardise a sustainable business on Tenby High Street and that prosecution would be disproportionate.

The Solicitor advised that the recent court hearing had been a preliminary one dealing with procedural matters rather than the substantive merits of the prosecution. He advised that there had been discussions about how the situation could and should be resolved at that hearing and that there had also been discussions with the owner as to rectification works that would respect the listed building whilst allowing him to continue to trade from the building. The Director of Planning and Park Direction added that the owner had recently submitted an application to rectify the breaches identified, however this was currently invalid. Further advice had been provided, and if it was validated before case was due in court again, the situation would be reviewed.

Other Members considered that unacceptable works to a unique listed building should not be accepted. They noted that officers had tried to work with the relevant individuals to resolve the situation, however so far this had not been achieved and it was therefore appropriate that steps were continued to ensure that the listed building enforcement notice was complied with.

It was **resolved** that the Chief Executive/Director of Planning and Park Direction/ Development Management Team Leader be authorised to utilise the report in respect of unauthorised works to Medical Hall, Tudor Square Tenby as an addendum to the original report of 17<sup>th</sup> October 2018, clarifying the narrative in terms of when issues of unauthorised works arose.

**b) EC19/0020 – Land adjacent Castle Hill, Newport**

Members were reminded that an Enforcement Notice had been issued by the Authority on 15 July 2019 relating to the material change of use of land from agriculture to a mixed use for agriculture and residential by the siting and use of two caravans to provide living accommodation and the storage of a camper van. The Enforcement Notice had not been complied with in the period specified on the Notice and at the meeting of the Committee held on 2 September 2020, authorisation was given to instruct Solicitors to commence prosecution proceedings in the



Magistrates Court for non-compliance with the Enforcement Notice if the caravans had not been removed by the end of September 2020.

A site inspection had been carried out by officers in October 2020 and it was evident that although one of the caravans had been removed completely, the Enforcement Notice had not been complied with in its entirety as another caravan had been relocated within an adjoining field still encompassed by the Notice. An email had been received in February 2021 advising that the caravan had been removed.

Complaints had continued to be received from members of the public regarding the siting of caravan on the land, and noting that all the caravans had since been re-sited within the land affected by the Enforcement Notice.

The landowner had reasserted her claim that her use of the land for the siting of the caravans was agricultural use in accordance with 'permitted development' rights under Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. The report advised that whether her use did accord with permitted development rights had been considered by the Inspector in an appeal against the Enforcement Notice and it had been concluded that her use was not in such accordance. No further evidence as to how her use may have been in accordance with those permitted development rights had been forthcoming, despite repeated requests.

The siting of the caravan by the owner of the land remained in breach of the Enforcement Notice which remained extant and as a result a criminal offence had been committed under section 179(29) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. Prosecution as a means of remedying this breach of planning control and its harmful impact was therefore required.

It was **resolved** that the Chief Executive/Director of Planning and Park Direction/Development Management Team Leader be authorised to instruct Solicitors to commence prosecution proceedings in the Magistrates Court concerning the siting of the caravans on land adjacent to Castle Hill, Newport in breach of the Enforcement Notice.

## 8. Appeals

The Development Management Team Leader reported on 4 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.

It was reported that the appeal in respect of NP/19/0522/FUL at Buttyland Caravan and Camping Park Manorbier had been allowed and the



application for costs had also been allowed, and a copy of the Inspector's decision was appended to the report.

Some Members suggested that the Committee needed to reflect on the conclusions of the Inspector in respect of the Buttyland appeal which the Committee had refused contrary to the officer recommendation. Other Members defended their right to vote against the officer recommendation as an expression of democracy. It was noted that the Solicitor's report to each Committee summarised the circumstances where costs may be awarded against the Authority, and it was suggested that this could be the subject of a Members Workshop so that a wider discussion on the subject could take place.

**NOTED.**

