

Development Management Committee

20 October 2021

Present: Councillor R Owens (Chair)

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

[Virtual Meeting: 10.00am – 11.05am]

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M Evans and Councillor M James.

2. Disclosures of interest

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

Application and Reference	Member(s)/Officer(s)	Action taken
<i>Minute 6(a)below</i> NP/21/0251/FUL – Coed-derw, St Brides Hill, Saundersfoot	Councillor P Baker	Withdrew from the meeting while the application was discussed
<i>Minute 6(a)below</i> NP/21/0251/FUL - Coed-derw, St Brides Hill, Saundersfoot	Mrs J James	Disclosed a personal interest only and remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion thereon.
<i>Minute 6(c)below</i> Monterey Cypress Tree (T12/033) - Beach Court, The Strand, Saundersfoot	Councillor P Baker	Disclosed a personal interest only and remained in the meeting and played a full part in the discussion thereon but abstained from voting.
<i>Minute 7 below Appeals (NP/20/0407/FUL)</i>	Councillor P Baker	Withdrew from the meeting while the item was discussed



3. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on the 8 September 2021 and 4 October 2021 were presented for confirmation and authentication.

The Director of Planning and Park Direction noted that due to a discrepancy noted at the site visit held on 4 October 2021, NP/21/0085/FUL Meadow House Holiday Park, Stepside was not on the agenda before the Committee that day. Amended plans were awaited and it was hoped that the application would be considered at the December Committee.

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meetings held on the 8 September 2021 and 4 October 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, amended 16 June 2021, speakers would have 5 minutes to speak unless they had spoken on the same application previously when they would have 3 minutes in which to present new information (*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/21/0251/FUL	Demolition of existing garage/workshop, and other extensions. Modernisation of existing building and new two storey extension to form a change in use to provide Key (staff) worker accommodation (C3 class) which comprises, 16 No. self-contained studio rooms. The proposal provides 8 No. parking spaces at the front and rear of the property with one being a disabled space. There is also provision for six cycle stands at the rear –	Mr S Hanneby



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*):

[Having disclosed an interest, Councillor P Baker withdrew from the Committee during consideration of the following application]

- (a) REFERENCE: NP/21/0251/FUL
APPLICANT: Mr A Evans
PROPOSAL: Demolition of existing garage/workshop, and other extensions. Modernisation of existing building and new two storey extension to form a change in use to provide Key (staff) worker accommodation (C3 class) which comprises, 16 No. self-contained studio rooms. The proposal provides 8 No. parking spaces at the front and rear of the property with one being a disabled space. There is also provision for six cycle stands at the rear.
LOCATION: Coed-derw, St. Brides Hill, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9NP

Members were reminded that a previous application on this site had been refused by the Committee at its meeting in March 2021; the scheme before the Committee was of a similar type of development, but with a reduction in the size of the extension resulting in the creation of 16, rather than 18, rooms.



Officers advised that the principle of the development was acceptable, however any permission would require a Section 106 Agreement to link the property with the St Brides Spa Hotel, the staff of which would be accommodated in the development.

It was reported that the design philosophy was to retain the character of the dwelling and its architectural features as much as possible to the front when viewed in the street scene. To the side and rear the existing previous extensions would be removed and replaced with a two storey block of new accommodation comprising 6 units and would have the form of a box with a concealed flat roof. The design and materials proposed would add a contemporary appearance which would complement the existing traditional finishes of painted render and slate. The development would remove a group of unattractive extensions to the rear of the building. Officers considered that the reduction in scale had addressed the previous concerns about the scale, mass and bulk of the extension which would not now dominate the outlook from the neighbouring buildings and their amenity areas. As such, the current design was considered to have an acceptable impact on the visual amenity of this site and its surrounding landscape / streetscape. The proposed development was considered to conserve the special qualities of this area of the National Park, with any adverse impacts localised and acceptable.

In terms of amenity and privacy, it was not considered that the proposal would result in an unacceptable impact due to noise and disturbance; a condition could be included to control any external lighting. The agent had indicated that a new timber boundary fence would be erected to all of the rear boundary walls which would ensure that the impact on privacy from these areas was minimised. The proposed scheme also incorporated a fenestration design on the side elevations of the rear extension to limit the potential impact on neighbouring properties. The proposed fenestration to the rear of the extension would be a distance of 18 metres from a neighbouring dwelling to the rear with an apex window at a similar level and this distance together with the associated angle was considered to assist in providing a degree of privacy protection to this neighbouring property.

Officers concluded that the revised scheme now proposed was considered to be acceptable in terms of its scale, form and overall mass. It was considered that it would not have an overbearing impact on the amenity of neighbours and would not constitute an over-development of the site. The proposal was therefore considered to be reasonably in accordance with policies of the Local Development Plan 2, and the recommendation was one of delegated approval, subject to conditions as set out in the report and completion of an appropriate Section 106



Agreement to prevent the severance of the staff accommodation from the associated hotel.

At the meeting, the officer confirmed that to the best of his knowledge no correspondence had been received from neighbours in relation to this application. At Members' request, he had shown some drone footage provided by the agent, and Members asked about the privacy implications of such footage. The Director of Planning and Park Direction and the Solicitor agreed to look into this and to report to Members outside of the meeting.

The provision of additional planting to the boundaries was welcomed, and it was clarified that some of the trees shown on the slides were in the control of the neighbouring property. One Member asked whether consideration could be given to protecting existing green space, or ensuring a suitable level of restoration following works on site, to ensure there was no loss of biodiversity. The Solicitor suggested that amending condition 3 relating to boundary treatment to include landscaping may rectify that concern.

The only speaker was Sean Hanneby, the Agent. He explained that although Mr Evans, the applicant, had registered to speak at the meeting, it had been necessary for him to join the meeting from a car park via his phone. He would therefore be available to answer any questions from Members as long as his connection held.

Mr Hanneby reminded Members that this application was a resubmission, with the extension now reduced both in length (by 1.5m) and by 4.1m on the north side facing Springfields, in order to overcome objections. This made the proposed extension shorter than those currently in existence. He noted that there were no objections from statutory consultees, the Community Council or local residents and he urged the Committee to support the application in accordance with the officer recommendation. Mr Hanneby went on to stress that this staff accommodation was essential to the St Brides Spa Hotel business, and this need had become greater than ever since the removal of lockdown restrictions, with most rental accommodation in the village having been converted to Airbnb, leaving little or no option for affordable accommodation for staff. This situation had resulted in other hospitality businesses having to close, or never having reopened, due to a lack of staff.

The Director of Planning and Park Direction clarified that the Appeal that had been submitted on the previously refused application would be progressed separately from the revised application currently before the Committee and that a twin track situation was permissible and was not uncommon.



Members felt that the application before them would support the local economy and address climate change issues by reducing the need for travel. While some were pleased that the applicants had reduced the scale of the rear extension in response to the comments expressed previously, others were disappointed that this had been necessary as they had considered the previous application to be acceptable. One Member, however, stated that he would be unable to support the application due to the size of the extension and the potential disturbance to neighbours from staff returning at the end of their shifts.

It was proposed and seconded that the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to an appropriate unilateral undertaking and conditions as set out in the report, with the amendment of condition 3 to include a landscaping requirement.

DECISION: That the application be delegated to officers to approve subject to an appropriate unilateral undertaking under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to prevent the severance of the staff accommodation from the associated hotel and subject to conditions relating to the timing of development, accordance with plans and documents, boundary treatments and landscaping, surface water drainage, biodiversity/protected species, lighting, parking and occupancy.

- (b) REFERENCE: NP/21/0399/FUL
APPLICANT: REEF LTD
PROPOSAL: The retrospective construction of a livestock barn and works to / related to a silage clamp to support functioning of the working farm
LOCATION: Land opposite Middle Broadmoor, Talbenny, Haverfordwest, Pembrokeshire, SA62 3XD

It was reported that this application had been withdrawn from the agenda and would be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

Noted.

[Councillor M Williams tendered his apologies and left the meeting during consideration of the following application.]



- (c) REFERENCE: NP/21/0475/TPO
APPLICANT: Ms N Mallen
PROPOSAL: Monterey Cypress Tree (T12/033) - Clean crown of storm damage & thin canopy by 20 percent
LOCATION: Beach Court, The Strand, Saundersfoot, Pembrokeshire, SA69 9EU

Members were reminded that an application to fell the tree the subject of this application had been deferred by the Committee in June of this year to enable a TPO application to manage the tree to be made within 6 months of the date of the meeting and the management works to be carried out within 12 months.

Objections to the current application had been received from a third party, and these were set out in the report, together with the officer response.

Due to the location of the tree it was not possible to remove targets (property / persons) or restrict access to the tree and it was the opinion of officers that this tree could not be left unmanaged due to its current condition. The tree was a prominent feature on Saundersfoot beach and could be clearly seen in an arc of approximately 180° along the beach. The proposed works to the tree would aim to retain the feature of the tree as well as the outcrop on which it stood and as such the principle of the proposal was acceptable as an initial stage in its future management.

Councillor P Baker, who had previously disclosed a personal interest in the application, explained that he was one of those nominated by the Community Council to sit on the Lonely Tree Preservation Group, which was in the process of being constituted, and that he had previously asked that the minutes of its inaugural meeting be circulated to the Committee. He noted that the Group's accounts were looking healthy and the funding was in place to undertake the work. Members were pleased that the Community had taken responsibility for the tree and were working together.

Noting that the application sought the thinning of the canopy by 20%, which was less than the 30% maximum recommended by British Standards guidelines, Members were pleased to propose and second the recommendation of approval.

DECISION: That the application be approved, subject to a condition in respect of the timing of works.

Councillor P Baker abstained from voting and asked that this be recorded.



7. Appeals

The Director of Planning and Park Direction reported on 6 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. She noted that there was a typographical error in the report in that a Virtual Hearing date of 11th November had been confirmed for NP/20/0230/FUL Maes Gwenyn, Cilgwyn, Newport, not NP/20/0614/FUL Pantmaenog Forest, Rosebush.

With regard to NP/20/0407/FUL Coed-derw, Saundersfoot, one Member asked what would be the situation if the Authority lost the appeal and the application was granted permission, given that the Authority had just given permission for an amended scheme at the same property. The Director advised that the applicant would then have the option to implement either permission.

Councillor P Baker withdrew from the meeting while this discussion was taking place.

NOTED.

The Minutes of this meeting were confirmed at the meeting of the Development Management Committee held on 8 December 2021 without amendment

