

Development Management Committee

8 September 2021

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

Councillor P Baker BEM, Mrs D Clements, 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, Dr RM Plummer and Councillor A Wilcox.

[Mrs S Hoss and Councillor M Williams joined the meeting during consideration of application NP/21/0149/FUL (minute 6(a) refers)]

[Virtual Meeting: 10.00am – 11.55am; 12.05pm – 1.15pm; 1.45pm - 4.10pm]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Evans, Councillor K Doolin and Councillor S Yelland.

2. Disclosures of interest

There were no disclosures of interest.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on the 21 July 2021 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting held on the 21 July 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 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/21/0149/FUL <i>Minute 6(a) refers</i>	Change of use of land to create seasonal camping facility (7 no. tents & siting of	Peter Morgan, Dale CC Claire Williams - Applicant



welfare facility structure) –
Speedlands Farm, Dale

NP/20/0155/FUL <i>Minute 6(b)</i> <i>refers</i>	Proposed demolition of buildings and redevelopment to provide 14 no. dwellings, landscaping, access and associated works – Rochgate Motel, Roch	Dave Smith – Community Council & Community Land Trust - Objecting Shirley Bevan – Objector Ian Bowie - Applicant
NP/21/0015/FUL <i>Minute 6(d)</i> <i>refers</i>	Change of 6 touring caravans to 6 static caravans, associated external works including ecological and landscaping enhancements. – Wynd Hill, Manorbier	Michael Muskett – Objector Melanie Priestley– Manorbier CC - Objecting Geraint John – Agent
NP/21/0085/FUL <i>Minute 6(e)</i> <i>refers</i>	Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement. – Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepside	Mr Dorian Evans – Objector Amroth CC - Objecting Geraint John - Agent
NP/21/0177/FUL <i>Minute 6(f)</i> <i>refers</i>	Addition of a single storey side extension over existing driveway and provision of additional parking space to front of property – 7, Green Meadow Close, Marloes	Rosalind Scott – Objector Chris Jessop – Marloes & St Brides CC - Objecting Richard Atkins – 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.

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 would be altering the order in which applications were considered to allow item 5 e) to be considered first]

- (a) 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

Members were reminded that this application had been considered at the previous meeting of the Committee when they had been "minded to approve" it notwithstanding officer advice that the development was contrary to the Local Development Plan, and the 'cooling-off' period had been invoked. The reason given for the decision was that the development's economic value to the area outweighed the policy conflict.

The Monitoring Officer advised that Members should consider matters afresh, including any new information presented. Should they again wish to approve the application contrary to officer advice, they would be required to state their reasons for doing so, and a recorded vote would be taken. He also advised that there was a risk of the Authority incurring legal costs.

Officers had advised that 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 and campsites 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. Development of this site for the proposed use would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and special qualities of the National Park.

Officers did not consider that the development's economic value to the area outweighed the policy conflict. The site was small scale and if there were to be a local economic need (which was not evidenced in the application) then that could be better catered for at an alternative location or by improvements to existing facilities. The recommendation therefore remained one of refusal, however suggested conditions were included in the report should Members be minded to approve the application.

At the meeting, the officer advised that no response had been received from Natural Resources Wales (NRW) in respect of the Habitats Regulations Assessment prepared by the Authority's Ecologist, and therefore if Members were minded to approve the application, this would have to be delegated to officers, subject to NRW confirming they had no objection. She also drew Members attention to the first suggested condition included in the report, under which permission would be granted for a period of five years to allow the impact of the development on the landscape and residential amenity to be monitored. This would replace the need for the applicant to submit a legal agreement which tied the development to the farmhouse.

In response to questions from Members, the officer confirmed that the bell tents were no longer located in the C2 flood plain and that all objections from neighbouring properties had been withdrawn, however she noted that the recommendation remained one of refusal due to the conflict with policy and detrimental impact on amenity.

The first of two speakers due to speak on this application was Peter Morgan, speaking on behalf of Dale Community Council, however he proved unable to connect to the meeting. However it was confirmed that the Community Council were supporting the application.

The applicant, Clare Williams, then addressed the Committee. She had 3 minutes in which to speak as she had addressed the Committee on this application previously. She advised that although the officer's report referred to objections from neighbouring properties, these had now been withdrawn. She said that the family wished to maintain good relations with their neighbours, and as they also lived adjacent to the site, they didn't want noise disruption themselves. Also the likely maximum people per tent would be 5, rather than 8; she added that due to the cost of the outlay, there would probably be only 4 tents on site in the first year and therefore a maximum of 20 people. With regard to the potential flood risk,



Ms Williams referred to the report undertaken in May and confirmed that the tents were not located within the flood zone, but situated further up the field, which was on an incline; she added that water levels had never reached that point and the family did not want to site the tents where there was a risk of flooding. Ms Williams advised that the farm needed to diversify in order to provide the business with a more secure future, as her parents currently both had additional jobs. Their desire was to create a family friendly campsite which would allow visitors to explore the National Park and its surroundings, and she noted that the demand for such a facility was recognised locally, as there was a shortage of accommodation and some providers currently charged thousands of pounds. She concluded by saying that the application was supported by Dale and Marloes Community Councils as well as the Dale Estate and she asked Members to approve the application.

In answer to Members questions, Ms Williams confirmed that she believed no other fields were suitable for this development, due to their topography, visibility and also the proximity to existing water, sewerage and electricity connections. Ms Williams believed the field was sheltered from the wind and protected from any storm surge from the sea by the Gann estuary. She also advised that consideration had been given to removing the recreation area from the application, but would in any case ask for minimal noise after 10pm and she hoped that visitors would respect that. Members also asked about provision of an evacuation plan, however the officer replied that it was not considered reasonable to impose such a condition as the development did not have any built form.

A number of Members expressed their support for this application due to its economic benefit, in particular the shortage of self-catering accommodation in the area, support for farm diversification and the benefits that would be experienced by nearby pubs and shops. Some concerns were expressed about the proximity of the site to the flood zone, amenity and visual impact, however most Members felt that these had been addressed through the suggested conditions – the condition granting permission for 5 years only was welcomed as this would allow an assessment of the impact of the development to be made. It was also considered that it was preferable to grant permission with conditions than for the applicant to site the tents under the 28 day rule or through membership of a certificated camping organisation as these could not be regulated in the same way.

As a proposal to delegate approval of the application to officers, subject to no adverse comments being received from Natural Resources Wales with regard to the submitted HRA and to conditions as outlined in the report had been moved and second, contrary to the officer recommendation, a recorded vote was taken:



For: Councillor P Baker, Councillor D Clements, Councillor P Harries,
Councillor M James, Councillor P Kidney, Councillor P Morgan,
Councillor R Owens, Councillor A Wilcox
Against – Dr M Havard, Dr R Heath-Davies, Mrs J James, Dr R Plummer
Abstain – Mrs S Hoss, Mr G Jones, Councillor M Williams
Not present – Councillor M Evans, Councillor K Doolin, Councillor S
Yelland

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to no adverse comments being received from Natural Resources Wales with regard to the submitted HRA, and subject to conditions relating to timing (5 year consent), accordance with plans and documents, occupation of the site, temporary or seasonal use, noise management, timing of construction operations, arrangement for storing and collecting waste and refuse, external lighting, protection of existing trees and hedges and provision of a landscaping scheme.

- (b) 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

This application was reported to the Committee as it was a major development. Nolton and Roch Community Council had objected to the application and five further representations had been received and these were summarised in the report.

It was reported that the site contained buildings which formerly formed part of the Rochgate Motel which had been derelict for some time and largely abandoned. The site was therefore considered to be a brownfield site and was located outside of the Centre Boundary for Roch. However in principle, it was considered to form a sustainable location where an exceptional release of land to meet affordable housing need would be acceptable.

The proposed housing also had to be appropriate to meet the identified local housing need, and notwithstanding the objections received, officers considered that the applicant's proposal for a range of housing types and sizes reasonably meet the housing need identified in the Local Housing Market Assessment (LHMA) in the Nolton & Roch Community Council



area and surrounding Community Council areas. It was anticipated that the tenure of the housing e.g. whether it would be provided as social rented or intermediate housing could be appropriately negotiated as part of a Section 106 agreement.

The principle of the residential development of this site was therefore considered acceptable. It was of an appropriate density and in compliance with local and national policies. The general scale and massing of the proposed buildings was considered to fit in with the surrounding development. The scale of the buildings, the mix of house types and the palette of materials to be used on the site were generally acceptable in design terms subject to the future approval of material samples and the submission and control of design details. Appropriate conditions would ensure that the design was acceptable in the context of the site's location at the edge of the settlement and would also require appropriate landscaping. It was also considered that the removal of the existing buildings at the site would represent an element of planning gain, given their rundown appearance.

Officers considered that the proposal was in line with the requirements of the Local Development Plan 2 and National Planning Policy and the recommendation was one of delegated approval, subject to a Section 106 Agreement and conditions as set out in the report.

At the meeting, the officer advised that although no additional responses had been received from statutory consultees, more up to date information had been received from the Housing Department at Pembrokeshire County Council providing a snapshot of the current waiting list figures for those in housing need for Nolton and Roch Community Council area and the Community Councils immediately surrounding them. The officer shared this email with the Committee - it showed an overall need for 23 x 1 bed properties, 11 x 2 bed properties, 10 x 3 bed properties and 3 x 4 bed properties. They had therefore concluded that there was a high need for 1 bedroom accommodation in the area but also a need for larger properties as well.

In response to Members questions regarding sewerage, the officer confirmed that the site was outside of the phosphate catchment area and Dŵr Cymru Welsh Water had no objection to the proposals, subject to conditions. It was noted that as the site had previously contained a hotel, the proposal may in fact offer a reduction in foul water generated.

The first of three speakers on this application was Dave Smith speaking on behalf of Nolton and Roch Community Council and Nolton and Roch Community Land Trust (CLT). He advised that the CLT had undertaken a housing need survey last year which had returned a need for up to 40



new homes with 49% of respondents requiring three bedroom properties, 26% requiring two bedrooms and just 7% expressing an interest in both one bedroom and four bedroom properties. There was also strong support for affordable housing as long as it was for exclusively for local people. This provided the CLT with a dilemma as there was a clear need for affordable housing in the area so that local people were not forced to move elsewhere due to lack of housing and high rents, however they did not consider that the proposal reflected local need or best practice. Mr Smith noted that he had spoken in favour of the previous application to redevelop the site into a hotel as this would have removed the eyesore, however although the application was approved, it was never constructed as the site could not be sold on and the site had therefore decayed further, and he feared that the same fate would befall the current application.

Mr Smith also noted that the application was for housing on an exception site, and understood that such applications were only granted when the properties were for affordable housing, available for local people in perpetuity. He sought assurance that the housing would be affordable, as this was not clear from the application, nor what the term 'affordable' referred to, and also that there would be criteria which favoured those with a local connection and that this would remain the case. He believed there was a danger that the application would lead to new houses sold on the open market which would become second homes and holiday lets, which would be contrary to Planning Policy Wales as noted in a letter to the officer from the Planning Policy Team. He added that if this was addressed through a S106 Agreement, the community had no influence over this. A further point was made that the application did not make provision for electric vehicle charging or community open space, and the dwellings were not of a low carbon design. Their location meant that residents would have to cross the A487 road to access the village's facilities, and no provision for a pedestrian crossing or a speed limit reduction had been made. Finally he noted that the density of the development was 34 dwellings/ha, not 28 as stated in the design and access statement. He concluded by saying that although the community was crying out for housing, the proposal did not reflect local need and the developer had not engaged with the community to establish the need. He also believed there was no evidence that the housing would be affordable in perpetuity and would be for local need.

Responding to a question from a Member regarding the robustness of the CLT's survey, Mr Smith replied that the survey had been hand delivered throughout the village and distributed via the school. Copies had also been passed on to people with local connections who had moved away and wished to return. 120 responses had been received, and 90% of these were in support of developing affordable housing for local people.



He added that the survey had been funded by DTA (Development Trusts Association) and overseen and audited by an independent consultant.

In response to another question from a Member picking up Mr Smith's concerns regarding sustainable design and climate change mitigation, the officer advised that such measures would be required by Building Regulations. He also confirmed that the S106 Agreement would control the types of properties to be provided, their tenure and affordability.

The second speaker was Shirley Bevan who was objecting to the application. She explained that she had been born in Roch, went to school there and currently had a property in the village. She was very concerned about the lack of affordable housing in the village and wider Parish, and believed that people were forced to move out of the village as they were priced out by properties that became second homes due to its proximity to Newgale. She said that people living in Ocean Drive were desperate for larger properties in the village, where they had family and friends living. Even though the Rochgate site was crumbling, she did not believe that it was better to have something than nothing and she noted that neither the Community Council nor local people were in favour of the application. She said that what was required were 3-bedroomed houses that remained available for local people in perpetuity, and feared that unless they were properly policed, they would be sold as second homes. Ms Bevan was also concerned that allowing building on the opposite side of the road to the rest of the village would open the floodgates for other properties to be built there.

The final speaker was Ian Bowie, the applicant. He explained that the site was owned by his brother and himself and they were based in Solva. They had purchased the site several years ago, hoping to sell it on to the Premier Inn, however they gained planning permission for a hotel in St Davids. Noting the concerns regarding sewerage, he believed that a 40 bed hotel would have generated far more waste, and the current proposal would reflect a reduction. Addressing other concerns, he also explained that they were in negotiations with a Housing Association and the rented tenure of the properties would be controlled by the S106 Agreement to be agreed with Pembrokeshire County Council and the National Park Authority. He believed that there was a significant demand for 1 bed and 4 bed properties, and when these had been tested on the open market, 23,000 enquiries had been made. He believed that the development would help the economy and support the village school, shop and Post Office, as well as improving the look of the site and he said that he appreciated the patience of the community in its redevelopment.

Members drew Mr Bowie's attention to the CLT housing need assessment and asked him whether it had been taken into consideration. He replied



that his decision had been led by the requirements of Pembrokeshire County Council (PCC) as Housing Authority, as his original application had been for 18 x 2 bed properties, however he believed there was a huge demand in this location. He clarified that the properties tested on the market were open market 2 bed houses at an affordable price, however the advice he had since received was that they had to be for rent, not for sale and he confirmed that they would be run by a Housing Association. The Director of Planning and Park Direction confirmed that a requirement for a local letting policy would be included in the S106 Agreement which would be developed in conjunction with PCC Housing Department.

While they acknowledge the need for affordable homes in Roch, Members were confused by the type of properties needed, as the various reports gave conflicting answers. The Director of Planning and Park Direction explained that as the application had been developed in conjunction with the Housing Authority which had advised that they were content with the mix of housing proposed, refusal of the application would be difficult to defend at appeal. Other Members agreed that, although they recognised the concerns, there was an overwhelming need for affordable housing in Pembrokeshire and the recommendation of delegated approval subject to completion of a S106 Agreement and conditions as set out in the report was moved and seconded.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve, subject to receipt of a S106 Agreement within three months and conditions in relation to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, drainage scheme, no development in proximity to the public sewer, access roads and footways, parking and turning, no direct access to the A487 road, landscaping, schedule of materials, Construction Method Statement, hours of operation for works, lighting plan, Biodiversity Enhancement and Management Plan, slab levels and ridge heights.

If no S106 Agreement was forthcoming, officers were delegated to refuse the application.

[The Committee adjourned between 11.55am and 12.05pm]

[Councillor D Clements tendered her apologies and left the meeting]



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/20/0516/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr B Edmunds
PROPOSAL: Proposed addition of two chalets & three accommodation pods
LOCATION: Site adjacent to existing Chalets, Lawrenny Quay, Kilgetty, Pembrokeshire, SA68 0PR

It was reported that Lawrenny Quay was an established “owners only” chalet and caravan park, boatyard, pub and tearoom alongside the Cleddau Estuary set among mature trees. The site of development formed an area of existing hardstanding and a small grass area within the existing holiday park currently used to provide vehicle parking and pitches for touring caravans.

Officers considered that the proposal was acceptable in principle, subject to detailed consideration of the landscaping, due to the nature of the site with existing landscaping and the location and limited scale of the proposals.

Correspondence had been received from the Martletwy Community Council which raised continuing concerns regarding the appropriateness of the access to the site and the potential for a detrimental impact on highway safety and the free flow of traffic. However following discussions with the applicant, the Highway Authority had withdrawn its earlier objection, as the proposal would replace existing touring pitches at the site and would not lead to further congestion or danger on the highway.

The development site lay adjacent to the Pembrokeshire Marine Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the Milford Haven Waterway Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) surrounded the entire caravan site. An appropriate assessment of the scheme had been undertaken by the Authority’s Planning Ecologist, and it was reported at the meeting that no response had yet been received from Natural Resources Wales (NRW).

Officers considered that the development would be in keeping with the aims of the LDP2 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 schedule of suitable conditions to control the development, it was considered to be acceptable. However officers asked that approval be delegated subject to an acceptable response being received from NRW.

Members considered that the proposal would result in a reduction in traffic to the site overall, and the recommendation to delegate approval of the application was proposed and seconded.



DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers subject to the Habitats Regulations Assessment being found acceptable by Natural Resources Wales and subject to conditions relation to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, full plans of the holiday accommodation pods, location and occupation of chalets and pods, removal of permitted development rights, lighting and parking.

- (d) 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

This application was before the Committee at the request of the Director of Planning and Park Direction. An objection had also been received from Manorbier Community Council as they considered the proposal would result in static caravans on the skyline as you entered Manorbier, and several other letters of objection had also been received, as set out in the report.

It was reported that this site was screened to the north, east and west by existing buildings, trees and field boundaries but was exposed to the south where it could be seen prominently on the ridgeline with a mature landscape backdrop. The site had a Certificate of Lawfulness for 6 touring caravan pitches and toilet block for use from 1st March to 30th November.

This application also included provision of additional landscaping as part of the field immediately to the south and north of the land currently used as a touring caravan site, within which a new pond, woodland, wildflower meadow, screen planting, hedgerow planting and an orchard were proposed. Officers considered that these elements of the application would significantly assist in screening the proposed static units, potentially improving the situation whereby the currently permitted touring caravans were exposed and prominent in the landscape. Screening would further be assisted by using appropriately coloured caravan units.

The site lay within a Registered Historic Landscape and Natural Resources Wales, CADW and Dyfed Archaeological Trust (DAT) had also been consulted in terms of the potential impact of introducing the landscaping elements into the landscape here. It was reported at the meeting that since writing the report Cadw and DAT had confirmed they had no comments on the application.



Notwithstanding the objections received, following consideration of the policies contained within the Local Development Plan 2 and National Planning Policy and having regard to all material considerations it was considered 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 schedule of suitable conditions to control the development, the development was considered to be acceptable and the recommendation was one of approval.

The first of three speakers was Melanie Priestley, who read a statement prepared by Manorbier Community Councillors. They described Manorbier as an historic, picturesque village with a conservation area creating the idyllic Manorbier Bay, however they noted that it already had a large number of caravan sites, tents, glamping pods and camping spaces in the village, with an existing touring site recently granted permission for 80 static caravans just down the road; the community did not believe that more pitches were needed. It was noted that as a touring site, visitors to Wynd Hill regularly came and went, however converting the units to static caravans would lead to larger number of visitors, increasing the use of overstretched infrastructure, light and noise pollution and an increased number of vehicles on what was already a busy road all year round. They also feared that the units would be occupied as permanent residences and questioned who would ensure that any conditions imposed on the application were not breached. They did not consider that the visual impact on the landscape would be acceptable aesthetically and would affect the natural beauty of the village; they did not want to see additional statics causing a blot on the landscape. The Community Council asked Members to refuse the application in the interests of the community of Manorbier.

The second speaker was Michael Muskett who owned a neighbouring property and was objecting to the application. He said that he wished to make two points, firstly regarding the way that the proposed development's conflict with policy was dealt with in the officer's report. He agreed that there was a clear conflict as static caravans would be located on an open site that was exposed to the coast, visible from the coast path and in a registered historic landscape area, with the units particularly visible over the winter months. However he was surprised that the officer's report did not refer to the siting guidance contained in the Manorbier Landscape Character Area (LCA) which said that further static caravans should not be sited in registered areas. He was concerned that despite the conflict with policy, the recommendation was of approval on the grounds that the development would be mitigated by landscaping, He believed that this could set a precedent that the provision of landscaping could override policy and mitigate the effect of otherwise unacceptable



proposals. It would also encourage further static units in the registered historic landscape area, contrary to policy. The second point he wished to make was that his property was at the southern end of the development site, and he was concerned at the plan to plant trees close to his house, particularly as they would be upwind from the prevailing wind, and this would lead to a loss of light, overbearing nature and risk of storm damage to his property over time. He asked the Committee that should they approve the application that a condition be imposed to increase the distance of the trees from his house and to reduce their height by selecting smaller species than those specified.

The final speaker was the agent, Geraint John. He noted that as set out in the report, planning permission was sought for the substitution of 6 existing touring caravans with 6 statics, along with additional landscaping and ecological improvements, and the recommendation was one of approval. He stated that the starting point was the existing lawful use of the site as confirmed by a certificate of lawful use for the 6 touring pitches and the toilet block. Turning to the policy position, he noted that policy 41 allowed for changes of pitch types on existing sites and the principal of development was therefore acceptable. There were also no objections from statutory consultees other than the Community Council. Officers considered the application to be acceptable on all grounds and in respect of highway safety and access there was considered to be a safety gain. Turning to landscape and visual impact, officers considered that there was potential to accommodate the static caravans without adverse impact on the National Park due to significant additional landscaping which would assist in screening the units and would improve the situation as the existing units were prominent. The landscaping would visually constrain the proposed change of use, leading to an enhancement in the area, and this would be assisted by appropriately coloured units as set out in the conditions. The southern boundary was currently quite open and he anticipated that the static units would be less prominent than the existing touring units.

Turning to some of Members' questions, Mr John advised that the wildflower meadow was already in situ, and this would be supplemented and retained in perpetuity, and the pond would be for biodiversity only and would not be accessible to the public as an amenity. The existing toilet block would remain, but would be repurposed for maintenance and housekeeping. With regards to the concerns of the Community Council, he noted that there would be no increase in units and the substitution of tourers with statics would lead to a decrease in traffic as the caravans would no longer be towed on and off the site. In respect of landscaping, a condition would require details of this to be agreed and he believed the planting could be adjusted so that there would be no impact on the neighbouring property, in fact the planting to that part of the site was not



needed to provide screening but was associated with biodiversity gain, so there was every opportunity for the species specified to be compatible. He concluded by urging Members to approve the application in line with the officer recommendation.

A number of Members were concerned about the cumulative impact of permissions for static caravans in the area and the visibility of this site in particular from the coast path, and a motion to refuse the application was proposed and seconded. However it was noted that should permission be granted, enforcement of the conditions imposed would be essential. Other Members were pleased to see the level of landscaping proposed, and in particular the provision of an orchard, meadow and pond, and believed that this would be a huge improvement on the current site. However they requested that condition 5 be amended to ensure the landscaping remained in perpetuity, and also requested an additional condition in respect of lighting. It was also hoped that the concerns raised by the neighbour could be taken into consideration in agreeing the details of the landscaping plan.

A vote on the motion to refuse the application was then taken, but this was lost. A substantive motion to approve the application, subject to the conditions set out in the report together with those in respect of lighting and landscaping requested at the meeting, was then put to the vote and this gained a majority of votes.

DECISION: That the application be approved subject to conditions relation to timing of the development, accordance with plans and documents, visibility in respect of the carriageway, colour of the static caravans, landscaping, protection of trees and hedges, location and occupation of the caravans, lighting and removal of permitted development rights.

[The Committee adjourned for lunch between 1.15pm and 1.45pm]

[Councillor A Wilcox did not re-join the meeting and Councillor M James arrived during consideration of NP/21/0085]



- (e) REFERENCE: NP/21/0085/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr Huw Pendleton, Celtic Holiday Parks
PROPOSAL: Change of use of land for the siting of 9 relocated static caravans, associated infrastructure, improvements to existing site access and ecological enhancement
LOCATION: Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepside, Narberth, Pembrokeshire, SA67 8NS

The application was reported for determination by the Committee as the officer recommendation for approval was contrary to the recommendation of Amroth Community Council that the development should be refused. Several other letter of objection had also been received as set out in the report.

It was reported that Meadow House was a large caravan park accommodating just under 200 static caravan pitches. Forty-seven of these pitches were permitted under a change from 55 touring pitches at the northern end of the holiday park (reference: NP/10/0450). It was 9 of these pitches which were now being proposed for relocation to a previously undeveloped area within the holiday park to improve the internal layout of the caravan park and to allow a greater degree of landscaping to the overall site. It was not proposed to increase the overall number of pitches within the site.

The applicant had submitted a landscaping scheme in order to provide mitigation against the visual impact of the proposed 9 static caravans. The landscaping scheme included the creation of a hedgebank to the frontage to the public highway and planting along the site boundaries and between units. In terms of landscaping, the application proposed a good level of new soft landscaping throughout the site which would increase the screen planting around the caravan site. The site was visually contained within the immediate vicinity and with the additional boundary landscaping proposed would be screened from neighbouring properties. This area of the site was not visible from the coast and would not appear as a skyline development.

Assessed against the current policy context, subject to a Section 106 Agreement to secure the removal of units elsewhere on the overall site, and securing appropriate landscape mitigation, it was considered that the scheme could be supported in terms of its impact on the visual amenity and special qualities of the National Park.

Objections had been received in respect of the privacy impact from the proposed static caravans on existing residential properties, as well as the potential for noise and disturbance from occupiers of the site. Officers considered that the layout of the units, the layout of



neighbouring properties, the distances and separation by a public highway would effectively mitigate privacy impacts to a large extent. Taken with improved landscaping along the western boundary which could be secured by condition, this would further filter views between the site and neighbours. It was considered that subject to condition the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact due to a reduction in privacy.

Notwithstanding the objections received the proposal was considered to be subject to effective landscaping and the reduction in units elsewhere on the site would have an overall effect that 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, it was considered to be acceptable and complied with the requirements of Local Development Plan 2 and National Planning Policy. The recommendation was one of delegated approval, subject to a S106 Agreement to modify planning permission NP/10/0450 to prevent the full development of the site as authorised.

The first of three speakers was Dorian Evans, who was objecting to the application. He explained that he lived opposite the site and had moved there before the clubhouse was built, when the field was a paddock. He hoped that Members had seen the full content of his objection, rather than the summary outlined in the report, as this gave an explanation for the objection and legal reasoning, contraventions and non-enforcement of previous applications and appeal at this site. Referring to the previous application for the stationing of 8 lodges on this site, Mr Evans quoted from the Inspector's decision in dismissing the appeal (June 2012), which referred to impacts on character and appearance of the area, setting, residents' amenity, highways and biodiversity among other matters, and he did not believe that anything had changed. His property would still be overlooked and be affected by noise and light pollution. While the photographs shown by the officer were taken while the trees were in leaf, this would not be the case in winter when the site would be in full view. He therefore asked that Members undertake a site meeting to see the proximity of neighbouring properties and also the elevation of the proposed site in comparison to the road which would allow the caravans to cause overlooking. He noted that up until a year ago the clubhouse had been screened by large trees; now he could see the lights from the clubhouse and noted that the caravans would be closer still to his property; the situation would be exacerbated by the recently granted extension to the club's opening hours by the Licencing Authority. Mr Evans went on to question the need for relocation of the caravans and asked whether consideration had been given to use of the field at the far end of the site instead. In summary he objected to the



application as it would cause overlooking, light and noise pollution and intrude on neighbouring privacy. He also feared there would be damage to nature and wildlife as a reduction in bird species had already been observed since the ground works and tree felling had taken place.

As they were unable to attend the meeting, the Monitoring Officer then read a statement by Amroth Community Council. It advised that they had received several letters of objection from local residents with regard to the conversion of the seasonal touring pitches to year round permanent static caravans. With regard to the current application, concerns had been raised regarding privacy issues, the further extension of the site westwards and the density of caravans this would create in Summerhill and the wider designated Landscape Character Area 1 defined in the Authority's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on camping, caravans and chalets. The Community Council noted that the site for the proposed caravans was higher than the public highway and overlooked some immediate neighbouring properties. Until recently it had been covered in mature trees which provided a break in the line of sight of caravans in the area, however these had been felled in the last 6 months and as a result the site was now very visible from those properties and from the footpath between Church View, Summerhill and Pleasant Valley. If the application were approved, residents would have caravans both directly above them and behind them (at Oakland Caravan Park) which would be detrimental to their privacy and enjoyment of what was considered a rural setting. It was also noted that the field that was being converted from touring pitches to static caravans was very visible from the public highway and had changed the appearance of the village of Summerhill and the outlook for residents of Church View. Questions were asked about the concrete bases already laid in this field which would no longer be needed. Moving the 9 caravans to the field on the western side would result in caravans being visible on both sides of the entrance to the Holiday Park. There was a growing concern from residents regarding the increasing size and spread of caravan parks and holiday sites in the immediate and wider Community Council area, having a negative and detrimental effect on the National Park and on the local community.

Residents had also expressed concern that the application did not comply with the Authority's SPG for camping caravans and chalets and therefore did not comply with the Local Development Plan. The proposals would add to caravan density and be detrimental to visual impact, rather than reducing density and improving green spaces/trees. Finally the Community Council did not consider that the application was significantly different to one made previously which had been refused by the Authority and on appeal to the Planning Inspectorate.



The final speaker was the agent, Geraint John. He explained that the application sought permission for the change of use of land to relocate 9 static caravans with no increase in development. He noted that officers had found the application complied with the Local Development Plan in principle and considered the relocation of the caravans from the northern field, which was more visible, to be a betterment. The landscaping proposed would also mitigate the development. He advised that the scheme was materially different to that refused on appeal as the planning policy context had changed. Also the application was for relocation of existing units rather than an increase in development. Mr John believed that as the landscaping had been supplemented in this area, the development would not have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring properties. The Highway Authority had no objection subject to an improvement to the access to increase visibility and other statutory consultees either had no objection or had requested conditions. While there had been representations from neighbouring properties and the Community Council, these had been assessed as part of the officer's report with the conclusion that the proposal was acceptable.

The Agent noted that the application would lead to economic development benefits due to the increase in visitor spend. He also advised that the non-native *Leylandii* trees had been felled as this had been recommended in a biodiversity assessment and the area had always been considered as part of the caravan park. With regard to the northern part of the site from which the caravans were moving, the Agent advised that this area would be subject to further planting and this could be required by condition as it was within the ownership of his client.

Members asked Mr John about the business case for moving the units from one part of the site to another, and he advised that it would provide a higher quality specification with a lower density. The field which was proposed for development was currently redundant and would allow better spacing of units on the more prominent part of the site.

Some Members remained concerned about the proximity of the development, its height and the potential for overlooking and an increase in noise, as well as the cumulative impact of the neighbouring caravan sites. It was proposed and seconded that the application be deferred to allow Members to visit the site.

DECISION: That the application be deferred to allow a Member Site Inspection to take place.



[Dr R Heath Davies and Dr R Plummer tendered their apologies and left the meeting at this juncture, while Mrs S Hoss left during consideration of the following application NP/21/0177.]

- (f) REFERENCE: NP/21/0177/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr R Atkins
PROPOSAL: Addition of a single storey side extension over existing driveway and provision of additional parking space to front of property
LOCATION: 7, Green Meadow Close, Marloes, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3AF

This application was before the Committee as the officer recommendation of approval was contrary to the view of Marloes & St Brides Community Council. A number of objections had also been received and these were detailed in the report.

The application site related to a semi-detached dwellinghouse situated within a residential cul-de-sac. Planning permission was sought for the erection of single storey extension onto an existing driveway. The extension would be of a lean-to design with all external finishes matching the existing house. New parking space was proposed to the front of the property to compensate the loss of parking to the side.

Officers considered that the proposed single storey extension was of a modest size, contained within the residential curtilage of the property and would provide additional living accommodation at ground floor level which was considered to be acceptable in principle. They also consider that the privacy and amenity of neighbours would be protected along with the character and amenity of the site and surrounding area.

Correspondence had been received from third parties objecting to the current proposal to extend the property. The report considered the issues of overdevelopment of the site, access to the oil storage tank in the rear garden and issues of access and parking and Officers concluded that the proposed extension was of an acceptable scale and design, and that other objections could be dealt with by condition. The Highway Authority had been consulted on the proposed development and had commented that the submitted plans showed that the driveway would be extended at the front of the property to accommodate for the loss of the driveway being used for the side extension. They had not raised any objections on highway grounds to the plans as proposed. It was also noted that restrictive covenants were not considered as material in applications for planning permission as they were a civil matter.



Officers concluded that notwithstanding the objections received, the proposed development was considered to comply with all relevant LDP2 policies and the application was therefore recommended for approval subject to appropriate conditions.

The first of three speakers was Rosalind Scott, a neighbour speaking on behalf of residents in numbers 8, 9, 10 and 11 Green Meadow Close. She asked the Committee to refuse the application as there would be a loss of amenity for these properties, given the loss of 3 parking spaces out of 6, and the development would also not be in keeping with the character of the village. She explained that when she had purchased the property, it had been an attractive close of semi-detached houses, each with 2 parking spaces. Residents were aware that permitted development rights had been removed and that restrictive covenants limited use of driveways for parking only; she believed it was clear and reasonable that this situation would remain as those purchasing were aware that the properties could not be changed or extended.

Ms Scott noted that parking in the Close was complicated – the two spaces alongside each house were narrow but adequate – however part of the drive needed to be empty to allow others to access their properties. If this development was allowed, she would lose access to one of her parking spaces (the narrow space remaining would not allow the car doors to be opened), while her neighbour at number 9 would not be able to access any spaces. This had not been addressed in the officer's report. Also she did not believe that the plans submitted by the applicant were accurate and it was therefore unfair if the decision was based on incorrect information. Further, as the development would be nearly to the boundary, access would be required from her property to build and maintain the extension. This would reduce the value of her house and prevent her from building a similar extension. Access from her property would also be required for her neighbours to fill their oil tank as there would be no room for a pipe; this was also a safety issue.

In conclusion she advised that if the development was allowed, a four bedroom terrace house in the London style would be created, which wasn't in keeping with the area, and she feared other properties would follow suit – the soft landscaping style had already been lost as the lawn had been replaced.

The second speaker was Chris Jessop, on behalf of Marloes and St Brides Community Council who joined by phone. He made the following points: the extension would constitute overdevelopment, noting that permitted development rights had not been removed without good reason; dedicated parking had formed part of the original application, and its retention was protected by a developer covenant as no parking was



permitted on the access road. The development would therefore lead to overspill parking onto Glebe Lane and other roads, compromising the existing situation. It would also be difficult for visitors to park and the clearances for pedestrians and disabled access would be compromised. There would also be a significant loss of amenity to neighbouring properties and the applicant could not assume that access to the oil tank could be gained through the neighbouring property. Mr Jessop considered that the reference to the Highway Authority was irrelevant as the estate road was not adopted. Finally the Community Council believed that the aesthetics of the estate would be compromised as a terrace would be created, setting a precedent, however it was important that all residents in the estate were treated fairly, as permission for extensions could never be granted to all residents.

The Final speaker was Richard Atkins, the applicant. He explained his motivation for undertaking the work as that he wanted to move back to the house, and adding to the downstairs area would increase the living space. He noted that most of the other properties in the estate were holiday homes or otherwise let and the living space was suitable for that, but did not really have space for a dining table or laundry appliances. Replacement of the two spaces would be made on the front garden and the dimensions provided showed that there would be no restrictions of access on the original drive and would in no way change the access arrangements of numbers 8, 9 or 11. He considered that other comments made had been misleading, noting that many of the properties did not have parking to the side, but had only a small walkway between them and cars parked to the front. This meant that many houses would not be able to build a side extension, there being only 3 or 4 where it was possible. With regard to access to the oil tank, he had been advised that 15cm was more than sufficient, however it would also be possible to bring the pipe through the house. He said that there was a danger of double standards as it was expected that his drive could be used to walk to parking spaces, however his neighbour's drive could not be used to allow him to fill his oil tank. Finally he noted that parking arrangements would be simplified as there would be no need to 'shuffle' cars so that the one parked on the inside could drive away.

One Member noted that it was a tightly built estate and it was difficult to see how there could be room for the properties to be extended. It was considered unfortunate that so much distress had been caused through these proposals. However the officer 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, details of how oil tank to be accessed and materials to



match existing.

[Councillor P Kidney tendered his apologies and left the meeting at this juncture]

- (g) REFERENCE: NP/21/0382/S73
APPLICANT: Mr R Farnham
PROPOSAL: Variation to Condition 2 of NP/07/240 - Amendments to Design
LOCATION: Plot Adjacent to Berry Bach, Newport, Pembrokeshire, SA42 0QF

This application was before the Committee as Newport Town Council had objected on design grounds, contrary to the officer recommendation. One letter of objection had been received, as set out in the report.

This application proposed a variation of condition no 2 attached to planning permission NP/07/240 to allow for an amended design. Planning permission ref: NP/07/240 had granted consent for a three-bedroom detached house, in a one and a half storey building, constructed with a painted render finish, slate roof and timber painted windows. Planning ref NP/19/0088/S73 had approved a change in design to a 2-storey property, this application had kept to the approved footprint and form of the building but sought to change window design and add patio doors at ground floor level to the rear (north) elevation. Work had begun on site, evidenced by visible footings. It was not entirely clear which permission had been implemented as they had the same footprint, but officers were not in a position to say that the 2007 permission was not implemented and was not extant.

Officers considered that the acceptability of this application largely related to the difference between the approved plans and the modifications proposed in this scheme. Notwithstanding objections received from Newport Town Council and a neighbouring property, the proposed design was considered appropriate and simplified the front (south) elevation. The development would have an acceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area and would not cause an unacceptably detrimental impact to the special qualities of the National Park. It was not considered that the development would cause an unacceptable impact upon privacy or amenity of neighbouring properties. Ecology and landscape features would not be adversely affected by the development. As such, the proposal complied with policies of the adopted Local Development Plan 2020 and could be supported.

One Member was concerned with the design of the proposals, particularly the stone cladding and the window detailing, and noted that traditional



buildings in Newport were being lost to glass fronted buildings which did not fit the local vernacular. He asked for an additional condition to tie the height of the building into fixed datum points, should planning permission be granted. Other Members agreed that it was important for developments to maintain and enhance the landscape of the National Park and to be of high quality; however it was noted that the current application was not much worse nor much better than that which currently had permission. Nevertheless, the recommendation of approval, with the inclusion of a levels condition, was moved and seconded, however the vote was lost.

The Director of Planning and Park Direction confirmed that in this case, as the decision would not constitute a significant departure from adopted Development Plan policy, it would not be subject to the Authority's 'Cooling Off' period. However she noted that clear reasons for refusal needed to be provided. Members considered that the proposed design was not in keeping with the area, would cause light pollution and would negatively impact the special qualities of the National Park, and a substantive motion to refuse the application on these grounds was moved and seconded.

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

- 1. The proposed development by virtue of its design and fenestration will result in an increase in light pollution and will represent an incongruous feature in the immediate and wider landscape having an adverse impact on the special qualities of the National Park. The proposed development is contrary to Policies 7, 8, 9, 14 & 29.**

7. 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.

Appeal decisions in respect of NP/20/0230/FUL - Apple Tree Gallery Saundersfoot (appeal allowed and costs awarded) and NP/20/0435/FUL – Hill Cottage Little Haven (appeal dismissed) were appended to the report.

NOTED.

